

GOVERNMENT OF WEST BENGAL
Uttarpara Jaikrishna Public Library

7519 and

Acq. No. 7520, ~~7521~~

Date. 23. 7. 75

^{call}
Shelf List No. 052 E.D.I.

. Vol. 103 (Pt. 1 + 2)

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR
CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR
JANUARY, 1856 APRIL, 1856.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CIII.

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS, LONDON:
AND ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.

1856.

Worcester Public Library
Acq. No. 7519 - Date 23/11

LONDON :
Printed by SPOTTISWOODE & Co.,
New-street-Square.

CONTENTS OF No. 209.

	Page
ART. I.— 1. Histoire de la République d'Angleterre et de Cromwell (1649-1658). Par M. Guizot. 2 Tomes. Paris: 1854.	
2. Richard Cromwell. Par M. Guizot. Paris: 1856.	
3. History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth. By M. Guizot. Translated from the French by A. Noble, Esq. 2 vols. London: 1854.	
4. The Story of Corfe Castle, collected from ancient Chronicles and Records; also from the private Memoirs of a Family resident there in the Time of the Civil Wars. By the Right Hon. George Banks, M.P. for the County of Dorset. 1855,	1
 II.— 1. Himalayan Journals; or Notes of a Naturalist in Bengal, the Sikkim and Nepal Himalayas, the Khasia Mountains, &c. By Joseph Dalton Hooker, M.D., R.N., F.R.S. With Maps and Illustrations. A new Edition. 8vo. 2 vols. London: 1855.	
2. Western Himalaya and Thibet; a Narrative of a Journey through the Mountains of Northern India during the Years 1847-8. By Thomas Thomson, M.D., F.L.S., Assistant Surgeon Bengal Army. 8vo. London: 1852,	55
 III.— 1. Essai sur l'Economie Rurale de l'Angleterre, de l'Ecosse, et de l'Irlande. Par Léonce de Lavergne. Paris: 1854.	
2. The Rural Economy of England, Scotland, and Ireland. By Léonce de Lavergne. Translated, with Notes, by a Scottish Farmer. Edinburgh: 1855,	82
 IV.— Das Leben des Ministers Freiherrn vom Stein. By G. H. Pertz. Berlin. 6 vols. 8vo. 1849—1855,	104
 V.— Lectures to Ladies on Practical Subjects. Cambridge: 1855,	146
 VI.— Report of the Commissioners for the Investigation of alleged Cases of Torture in the Madras Presidency. Submitted to the Governor in Council of Fort St. George on the 16th April, 1855, and presented to Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1855,	153

CONTENTS.

	Page
VII.—1. Despatches of Captain M'Clure during the Voyage of H.M.S. 'Investigator' to the Polar Seas. 1850–1854. (Arctic Papers, presented to Parliament, 1855.)	
2. A Series of Eight Sketches in Colour, together with a Chart of the Route of the Voyage of H.M.S. 'Investigator' during the Discovery of the North West Passage. By Lieutenant Gurney Crosswell, R.N. London: 1854.	
3. The Last of the Arctic Voyages. By Captain Sir Edward Belcher, R.N. 2 vols. London: 1855.	
4. Narrative of Arctic Discovery; from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. By T. C. Shillinglaw, F.R.G.S.,	180
VIII.—1. Bibliothèque Contemporaine, 2 ^e Série. De Stendhal. (Œuvres complètes.) Paris: 1854–55. En vente.	
2. Vies de Haydn, et Mozart, et de Métastase. Nouvelle édition. 1 vol.	
3. Histoire de la Peinture en Italie. Nouvelle édition, entièrement revue. 1 vol.	
4. Rome, Naples, et Florence. Nouvelle édition. Préface inédite. 1 vol.	
5. De L'Amour. Seule édition complète. Augmentée de Préfaces et de Fragments entièrement inédits. 1 vol.	
6. Vie de Rossini. Nouvelle édition, entièrement revue. 1 vol.,	203
[And other Works.]	
IX.—1. The Isthmus of Suez Question. By Ferdinand de Lesseps, Minister Plenipotentiary. London: 1855.	
2. Essais par MM. Baude et Talabot sur le Canal de Suez. Revue des deux Mondes. Livraisons du 15 Mars à 15 Mai, 1855.	
3. The Dead Sea a new Road to India, &c. By Captain W. Allen, R. N. London: 1855,	235
X.—1. Geschichte der Feldzüge in der Asiatischen Türkei während der Jahre 1828 und 1829. Von Obrist Uschakoff. Leipzig and Moscow: 1838.	
2. La Russie dans l'Asie Mineure. Par Felix Fonton. Paris: 1840.	
3. A Campaign with the Turks in Asia. By Charles Duncan, Esq. London: 1855. 2 vols. 12mo,	267
[And other Works.]	



CONTENTS OF No. 210.

	Page
ART. I.—1. History of England, from the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Versailles. By Lord Mahon [now Earl Stanhope]. Vol. VII. (1780–1783). 8vo. London: 1854.	
2. Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox. Edited by Lord John Russell. Vol. III. 8vo. London: 1854.	
3. Memoirs of the Court and Cabinets of George the Third, from original Family Documents. By the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, K. G. Vols. III. and IV. 8vo. London: 1855.	
4. Memoirs of the Whig Party during my Time. By Henry Richard Lord Holland. Edited by his Son, Henry Edward Lord Holland. Vol. II. 8vo. London: 1854.	305
II.—1. The Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare, the Text carefully revised, with Notes. By Samuel Weller Singer, Esq. 10 vols. 12mo. London: 1856.	
2. Shakspeare's Werke, herausgegeben und erklärt. Von Dr. Nicolaus Delius. 1st vol. (Tragedies). Elberfeld: 1855.	358
[And other Works.]	
III.—1. Σπυρίδωνος Τρικουπῆς Ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἐπανάστασεως. Τόμοι Α' καὶ Β'. Ἐν Ἀντιόχειᾳ: 1853–4. [A History of the Greek Insurrection. By Spiridion Tricoupi. Vols. I. and II. London: 1853–4.]	
2. History of the Byzantine and Greek Empires, from 716 to 1453. By George Finlay. 2 vols. Edinburgh and London: 1854.	
3. Greece and the Greeks of the present day. By Edmond About. Translated by authority. Edinburgh: 1855.	386
[And other Works.]	
IV.—1. Chapters on Mental Physiology. By Sir Henry Holland, Bart., M.D., F.R.S. 1852.	
2. Psychological Inquiries: in a Series of Essays, intended to Illustrate the Mutual Relations of the	

	Page
Physical Organization and the Mental Faculties. By Sir B. C. Brodie, Bart., D.C.L., F.R.S. Third Edition : 1856,	423
[And other Works.]	
V.—1. <i>Conventio inter Sanctitatem Suam Pium IX. Summum Pontificem, et Majestatem Suam Cæsarem Regiam Apostolicam Franciscum Josephum I., Imperatorem Austriæ, cui subscriptum Viennæ 18va Augusti, 1855.</i>	
2. <i>Studien über das Oesterreichische Concordat vom 18. August, 1855. Wien : 1856,</i>	452
[And other Works.]	
VI.—1. <i>Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton. By Sir David Brewster, K.H., F.R.S., &c. &c. 2 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh and London : 1855.</i>	
2. <i>Correspondence of Sir Isaac Newton and Professor Cotes. Edited by J. Edleston, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 1 vol. 8vo. London and Cambridge : 1850.</i>	
3. <i>Analytical View of Sir Isaac Newton's Principia. By Henry Lord Brougham, F.R.S. &c. &c.; and E. J. Routh, B.A., Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. 1 vol. 8vo. London : 1855,</i>	499
VII.—1. <i>Modern Painters. By John Ruskin. Vol. I., containing Parts 1 and 2. Fifth Edition, revised. 1851. Vol. II., containing Part 3. Sections 1 and 2. Third Edition, revised. 1851. Vol. III., containing Part 4. 1856.</i>	
2. <i>Pre-Raphaelitism. 1851,</i>	535
[And other Works.]	
VIII.—1. <i>De l'Avenir Politique de l'Angleterre. Par le Comte de Montalembert. Paris : 1856.</i>	
2. <i>La Réforme Administrative en Angleterre. Par M. Charles de Rémusat. (Revue de Deux Mondes.) Paris : 1855.</i>	
3. <i>L'Angleterre au dix-huitième Siècle. Par M. Charles de Rémusat. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris : 1856,</i>	558
Note to ART. I.	
<i>Memoirs of Mrs. Fitzherbert. By the Hon. C.</i>	
<i>Langdale,</i>	591
<i>Index,</i>	597

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
JANUARY, 1856.

No. CCIX.

ART. I. — 1. *Histoire de la République d'Angleterre et de Cromwell* (1649-1658). Par M. GUIZOT. 2 Tomes. Paris: 1854.

2. *Richard Cromwell*. Par M. GUIZOT. Paris: 1856.

3. *History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth*. By M. GUIZOT. Translated from the French by A. SCOBLE, Esq. 2 vols. London: 1854.

4. *The Story of Corfe Castle, collected from ancient Chronicles and Records; also from the private Memoirs of a Family resident there in the time of the Civil Wars*. By the Right Hon. GEORGE BANKES, M.P. for the County of Dorset. 1855.

THE volume by the member for the County of Dorset illustrates the private memoirs of an English family in the time of the Civil Wars. The more important work by the great French statesman presents that portion of our history which succeeded to the Civil Wars, and for a time embodied their results. But what we have to say of M. Guizot's book and its hero, we are not sorry to have the opportunity of prefacing by some remarks upon the actors in the preceding struggle; and so much of what the English memorialist relates of those earlier stages of the conflict requires correction, that we could offer perhaps no introduction so appropriate to such celebration of its later scenes as will invite our criticism in the French historian.

From an address prefixed to Mr. Bankes's book we learn its origin. It appears that in the borough and neighbourhood of Corfe Castle there is a society established for purposes of

mutual improvement; that Mr. Bankes is its patron; and that in compliance with the wish of its members to have subjects suggested for lecture and discussion, he was induced to gather together as materials for such a purpose, 'from rare books and original family papers,' a volume full of historical facts relating to persons who at former times have inhabited or possessed the castle which gives its name to the district. He adds that his collections refer especially to a period of history wherein their particular neighbourhood was much concerned, and the interest of which will not soon pass away.

Mr. Bankes so speaks of the civil wars of the seventeenth century, and speaks truly. They have an interest which still concerns not only particular neighbourhoods, but every particular family and fireside in the kingdom; for under Heaven we owe it mainly to them that all English homes are now protected and secure. They were a war without an enemy, as one of their leaders said. They began in no sordid encounter of selfishness or faction, they involved no vulgar disputes of family or territory, and personal enmities formed no necessary part of them. In the principles they put to issue we continue ourselves to be not less interested than were our forefathers; and hardly a question of government has arisen since, affecting human liberty or the national welfare, which has not included a reference to this great conflict, and some appeal to the precedents it established. Nothing can be unimportant that relates to it, therefore, nor any service small that may clear up a doubt of the motives and conduct of its leaders; and if these, as the winter evenings have again arrived, should again be discussed in the Corfe Castle or any other improvement society, such hints as we are now about to offer will not be without their use.

We do not object to Mr. Bankes that he shows throughout his book a leaning to the Royalist party; for, believing that justice remained with the Parliament, we think not the less that high and noble qualities were engaged on the side of the King. His error is in supposing that the latter may not be admitted without discredit and doubt of the former. Our study of the period has led us to other conclusions, some of which, in the same spirit which leads him to address his friends in Dorsetshire, we would address to himself. After truly saying of the society to which he is patron, the humblest who are industrious in their callings can always teach something, and the highest in attainments have much to learn. We must do our best for each other. When the wished-for Millennium shall at last arrive, it will doubtless form the whole human race into a society for purposes of mutual improvement.

The ancestor who connects with the most striking period of

‘ of Strafford’s plans. Nothing could be more arbitrary in principle — more opposite to every recognised rule of established law ; nothing more unfit for adoption, unless the plea of necessity were admitted as decisive in its favour ; and, if success attends this measure, Strafford’s memory may stand relieved from at least a portion of the obloquy which has been heaped upon him.’ We are sorry to say that this is a very loose and idle way of dealing with the grave questions of English history, and likely to prove sadly misleading to the members of the Mutual Improvement Society at Corfe Castle.

First, let us state briefly what the Irish Encumbered Estates’ Act really was. It would, of course, be quite permissible to say that a single person might justly be held a traitor for taking it upon his own authority to do, what yet it would be perfectly right that Queen, Lords, and Commons should agree and unite to do. But we prefer to show that Mr. Bankes’s comparison is absolutely as well as relatively false ; that there is not the remotest analogy or resemblance between the things compared ; that the act done with authority is as good, as the act was bad which was done without authority ; and that so much ignorance of what was really implied in an important legislative measure, is hardly pardonable in one who is himself a legislator. An Act to relieve the encumbered estates of Ireland, by facilitating their sale when desired by owner or encumbrancer, had become a necessity. Nearly all the southern and western Irish counties were hopelessly insolvent. Around the wreck of what once was property clung such a frightful accumulation of mortgages, mortgagees, and settled annuitants, that, but for a timely hand stretched out to save, all must have gone to the bottom, with their dependent tenants and labourers. A plague itself could not more surely have struck the land with barrenness. Capital fled affrighted from the place, while labour starved ; and, whether the landlord owed most to his creditor, or the tenant to his landlord, or both landlord and tenant to the Government which was supporting them on the toils and taxes of the English people, it would have been hard to say. In this intolerable crisis it was that Parliament stepped forward and said, We will appoint three commissioners as trustees for the sale of these encumbered estates. They shall have power, for this purpose, to supersede the slow and dilatory action of the Irish Chancery. The purchaser shall be protected, by receiving under their conveyance an indefeasible title. The encumbrancer and the owner shall have the guarantee of a strict application of the purchase-money in discharge of encumbrances, and in distribution of the residue to those legally entitled. By

these means we hope to substitute a real for a nominal proprietary. Our object, in brief, is to take Ireland bodily out of chancery; and to enable the funds at present squandered in costly delays, receivers' fees, and the extortions as well as obstructions of the masters' offices, to be in future more legitimately employed on the cultivation of the soil, and the support and improvement of the people. Such was the Encumbered Estates' Act, framed by Lord Clarendon and Sir John Romilly, and such hitherto has been its beneficial operation. No single legislative measure in our time has done so much to regenerate a country.

And now let us attempt to describe, with equal brevity, what Mr. Bankes declares to have been its original or prototype in Strafford's Irish administration. The immediate drift of the whole of that statesman's policy, as every well-informed student of English history knows, was to raise money for Charles's wants in England. Through and beyond all his measures, he looked, as he expresses it over and over again in his dispatches, 'to raise a good revenue to the Crown;' and one scheme above all others presenting itself as well suited to this purpose, he dashed into it with that overbearing energy of will, which had afterwards upon his own destiny so fatal a recoil. It was a plan for increasing the royal demesnes by ferreting out so-called defective titles. The court lawyers were eager and ready with proof that the entire province of Connaught had fallen at some distant period to the Crown, on the forfeiture of its Irish chieftain; and though it was not denied that, by a series of formal patents from the sovereign, all this property had since been granted away and passed into the hands of different owners, yet so informal in almost every instance had the royal grants been, that little doubt could be entertained of the due discovery of a rich crop of flaws and quibbles on which to found proceedings for recovery. A more scrupulous man than Strafford would have been deterred by the failure of a former attempt in James's reign, thus to beggar and dispossess, on such obsolete pretensions, a fourth part of the proprietors of Ireland. A juster man would have desisted, on being told that the result of that failure was the formal promulgation subsequently, by James's successor, Charles himself, of certain royal *graces*, expressly recognising and confirming the validity of the titles in dispute. But considerations of this kind never stood in Strafford's way. He went straight to his object without regard to consequences, when his mind was once made up that the object must be achieved. 'Go it as it shall please God with me,' he wrote to Laud, 'I will still be thorough and throughout, one and the same! less than

‘thorough will not overcome it.’ He impanelled juries in the several counties, under penalty of heavy fines; forced them, by gross intimidation, into verdicts favourable to the Crown; fined one sheriff £1000 for having chosen an ill-affected jury; mulcted each recusant juror separately in the more ruinous exaction of four times that amount; staked the ‘*peril of his head*’ upon the issue; and mainly by the intemperate passion into which these transactions betrayed him against all who resisted, provoked half a nation to claim that terrible forfeit.

To its payment, at least under process of attainder, Mr. Banks says that even Hampden objected. He may be excused for saying so, since better-informed writers have said the same; but it is an error. The supposed authority is a speech of Hampden’s in Sir Ralph Verney’s ‘Notes,’ on the question of whether the Commons should attend the Upper House to hear Strafford’s counsel on the matter of law. This was a question in no respect vital to the bill of attainder. Colepepper voted with St. John against it, old Rudyard joining with Digby for it; and Hampden, in voting as he did, separated himself quite as much from the Hyde and Colepepper party as from his own friends on the extremer benches. It is entirely a misapprehension to argue as though the alternative were raised by the division, either to hear Strafford’s counsel at the bar, or to proceed with the bill; and for this plain reason, that both were ultimately done. Hampden’s opinion and vote prevailed (we should certainly have voted with him), and the bill of attainder nevertheless proceeded.

Against it, not more successfully, Mr. Banks enlists another celebrated popular name. ‘Denzil Holles,’ he says, ‘would take no share in it;’ but he forgets to tell his readers that Denzil Holles was Strafford’s brother-in-law, and that this fact must be assumed to have influenced his vote a little. Most bent is Mr. Banks on proving, however, that Edward Hyde, of all men, could have had no possible complicity with it. Unfortunately, he grounds the opinion on no authority better than Hyde’s own; holding that if he had not objected, his language to Lord Essex, set down in his own memoirs, would involve an incredible inconsistency. Mr. Banks appears not to know that the entire conduct of Hyde at this period is now proved to have been an inconsistency (to use no stronger word), deliberately planned on the largest scale, and carried out with a view to the profit to be made of it. When he declined to take office with Colepepper and Falkland, it was because ‘he should be able to do much more service in the condition he was in, than he should be if that were improved by any preferment.’ In other words,

he stayed among the patriots to make what royalist use he might of his knowledge of their plans. Even in his own history, he does not scruple to say as much, though not till a few years ago did his editors find courage to print it. It stands there now, a shameless avowal, on the same page which perpetuates his fame. When he had himself assented to a particular state paper issued by the House of Commons, he does not hesitate to inform us that the answer, issued some days later by the King, was copied from a draft prepared and privately forwarded by himself; and when, in committee on the bill for the extirpation of episcopacy, he was chosen chairman, he expressly tells us that he used the advantage it gave him to 'ensnare' and 'perplex' the advocates of the bill. Somewhat earlier, it may not here be out of place to add, he had sat also as chairman of a committee to hear witnesses in support of certain complaints brought before the House, on which occasion he seems to have found it extremely difficult to ensnare or perplex a particular member who sat with him. This was a gentleman whom he had 'never 'before' heard speak in the House of Commons, but whose whole carriage in the committee was so tempestuous, and his behaviour so insolent, that really Mr. Hyde found himself under the necessity of reprehending him. A rebuke which nevertheless appears to have had small effect on the honourable member, who 'in 'great fury reproached the chairman for being partial;' which, having regard to the confession just made in a precisely similar case, we are disposed to think that the chairman decidedly may have been. The honourable member who came so tempestuously on this occasion between the witnesses ('who were a 'very rude kind of people') and Mr. Hyde's sense of decorum, was Mr. Cromwell, lately returned for the town of Cambridge.

Altogether, we think Mr. Bankes will have to re-study and revise his character of Clarendon. He is moved with horror at what he calls the revolutionary, the 'fatal' act, for perpetuation of the Parliament; yet for that act Hyde deliberately voted. He (very inconsiderately we must say) compares to Robespierre's Reign of Terror, the excitements and pretended plots which forced on the execution of Strafford; yet the man who carried up to the House of Lords the first message of the army plot that directly led to the execution, was no other than Edward Hyde. Its resolute promoter to the last, by speeches as well as votes, was Falkland, Hyde's dearest friend. His own vote in favour of it was the last thing his associate Lord Capell recalled, as he laid his own head down upon the scaffold raised by Cromwell. And to the celebrated Protestation brought forward at this time by Pym, and which had such a singular

effect in exciting the people, the second name affixed was still that of Edward Hyde.

This is not a subject which needs to be pursued further. But it is not desirable that the constituents of any county member, in Dorsetshire or elsewhere, should be left under the impression that Robespierre's Reign of Terror, or any other of those bugbears of history which set the hairs of listeners on end, had a parallel in these days of their ancestors among either the yeomen or the gentlemen of England. If Mr. Banks be still enamoured of the comparison, it will be well that he should point out in detail the proscriptions and massacres which in his judgment justify it. At present, it is the belief of every writer who has shown himself most familiar with this period of English history, that with anything approaching to its temper under wrong, or its moderation in victory, no similar movement in the world was ever carried to its close. For the very plain reason, that far more of the real wealth of the kingdom was committed on behalf of the Parliament than at any time remained with the King, *sansculottism* never got the upper hand amongst us. Stern as were the few forfeits exacted on the scaffold, no blood was ruthlessly or causelessly spilt there. No monstrous innovations disgraced the progress of the struggle, and no infamous proscriptions marked its termination. The palaces of England stood throughout as unrifled as its cottages; and, except where fortified resistance had been offered, the mansions and manor-houses remained as of old, through the length and breadth of the land. While the conflict continued, no servile passions inflamed or disgraced it; and when all was over, the vanquished sat down with the victors in their common country, and no man's property was unjustly taken from him. To disprove all this will require something more than the unsupported assertion of the president of the Corfe Castle Society for Mutual Improvement.

'Not daring,' says Mr. Banks,—describing what he would 'improve' his fellow members into believing to have been a harmless act of self-defence on the part of the bishops, but which was in reality the most ill-judged of all the acts of those ill-advised men, — 'not daring to continue their attendance in Parliament, twelve of them, including the Archbishop of York, addressed a protestation to the House of Peers, which was presented by Lord Keeper Littleton. This being communicated to the House of Commons, those who signed this protest were immediately charged with high treason.' . . . 'The English,' continues Mr. Banks, in his next following paragraph, 'are thought to be less sanguinary in their days of political frenzy than the French; but undoubtedly the history

‘ of London in 1641 bears very many points of similarity with ‘ the history of Paris, from the year 1791 to 1793.’

Undoubtedly it does. But the points of similarity are all in one direction, and serve only to throw into startling contrast the more extraordinary points of difference. Not more surely did those advisers of poor Louis XVI. who precipitated his doom, resemble the men whose councils had driven Charles I. to the scaffold, than the frenzied wretches who bore aloft the mangled body of the Princesse de Lamballe, were unlike the calm self-resolute men who fought at Marston Moor. The act which Mr. Bankes so innocently calls a Protestation, as if it had simply protested against unmerited ill-treatment, was the result of an elaborate intrigue by Archbishop Williams, set on foot after Strafford’s execution, in the interest of the King. The declaration which he drew up, and induced eleven other bishops to join him in signing, was to the effect that as the bishops could no longer attend their duty in Parliament, they therefore protested against the validity of any votes or resolutions during their absence; and if this had *not* been rejected, and proceedings at once taken against its authors, the first step to the King’s now cherished purpose of revoking all that had been done in the past memorable year, on the ground that Parliament had not been free, would then and there have been accomplished. And let not Mr. Bankes imagine that this instant decision was in any manner swayed by the ‘organised riots’ of a London mob. Authorities less ‘rare’ than Hyde’s history, or that book by Rapin which is not quite so liberal as Mr. Bankes describes it to be, would have told him that the first ‘mob’ who interfered in the matter was the House of Lords; and that the bishops had been voted guilty of breach of privilege in the Upper House without a dissentient voice, before they were, with no less unanimity, impeached of high treason in the other.

In conclusion we would remark to Mr. Bankes, that he might have made his book at once a more pleasing tribute to the memory of his ancestor, and a better contribution to the knowledge of his contemporaries, by simply initiating himself, before he undertook it, into those earliest lessons of historical research which consist in being able to decipher ancient handwriting. Such letters as he gives us, and they are really valuable, are printed with sad mutilations; and half the letters discovered he has not been able to print in any form. Yet the time to which they refer was the most critical of all; and, at its turning point of ruin or safety for Charles I., their writer was by his royal master’s side, advising and warning him. Does Mr. Bankes understand the importance of even the soli-

tary letter of his ancestor which he has been able to decipher? Does he perceive that the great calamity of the kingdom is very plainly referred in it, not to organised mobs or reigns of terror, but to the fatal indecision of the King. 'I have adventured far,' writes the well-meaning Chief Justice, 'to speak my mind freely, according to my conscience, and *what hazards I have runne of the King's indignation in a high measure*—you will heare by others; *all men give not the same advice.*' Some remarkable men, high in the councils of the popular party, were now making a final effort to keep the sword still sheathed; and Sir John Bankes stood between them and the King, with what peril he has just hinted to us. Why, a mere study of the letters addressed to himself, here published by his descendant, even without the answers that lay beneath his hand (and which a little more pains and knowledge might have enabled him to publish), should have saved the little book that contains them from the dangerous errors it also unhappily contains.

Against these we have done our best to protect any classes of readers to whom a privy-councillor and county member might have spoken with pretences of authority. Mr. Bankes asserts that our civil wars began in organised riots, in democratic excesses, and in scenes such as inaugurated Robespierre's Reign of Terror. We say that they began in high and honourable good faith, and in an utter absence of personal animosities. He lays before us his volume, by way of proving his case; and we find that all the evidence adduced in its pages is clear against him. What, in letters now first published, says Lord Northumberland to Mr. Bankes's ancestor? what says Lord Wharton? what says Mr. Denzil Holles? what says Lord Say and Seale, a leader of the Puritans? what says even the leader of the parliamentary armies, Lord Essex? None of these men viewed with other than a sad reluctance the strife which was about to begin; none of them were eager to exaggerate or precipitate the quarrel. In two as impressive sentences as were ever written upon it, Lord Northumberland tells Sir John Bankes, that Parliament is arrayed against the King because of the peril of 'losing that liberty which freeborn subjects ought to enjoy, and the laws of the land do allow;' and because 'those persons who are most powerful with the King, do endeavour to bring parliaments to such a condition that they shall only be made instruments to execute the commands of the King.' In a letter of singularly earnest expression, Lord Wharton warns Sir John Bankes that he is intimate with many popular leaders, 'and I do seriously profess, I dare not in my privatest thoughts suspect or charge any of them for having

'disloyal hearts to his Majesty, or turbulent hearts to this State.' In a letter written from that very place in the House of Commons, which he occupied in close vicinity with Pym and Hampden, Denzil Holles tells the Chief Justice that the House of Commons only waits 'the first appearance of change in his Majesty that he will forsake those councils, which would divide him from his Parliament and people, and make them destroy one another,' to return in duty and affection to his person. In reply to a letter from the Chief Justice, soliciting his opinion, Lord Say and Seale more sternly warns him that 'your cavaliers (as they are called) do much mistake in persuading themselves or others, that there is any fear among those who desire the King's wealth and greatness, as it may stand with their own rights and liberty, and the end of his government.' Finally, in rough and unlettered but manly phrase, Lord Essex thus communicates to Sir John Bankes the grief with which he is about to unsheathe his sword: 'The great misfortunes that threaten this kingdom, none looks upon with a sadder heart than I, for in my particular my conscience assures me I have no ends of my own, but what may tend to the public good of the King and the kingdom.'

In truth it seems to us amazing that such errors as we have here been at the trouble to describe should be committed at this time of day by an educated English gentleman, in speaking of that earlier portion of the story of our civil wars on which nearly all intelligent inquirers might be thought to have laid aside their differences long ago. Surely the fairest judgments, from whatever opposite points of view, have generally been able of late years to arrive at substantially the same conclusion, on this first stage of the conflict; and, up to the arrest of the five members at least, to agree that a power to discriminate between good and bad faith is really all the investigation now requires. That the Long Parliament had no desire permanently to strip the Crown of any of its essential prerogatives, and did absolutely nothing, before the sword was drawn, which was not justified by the King's personal character, or of which the sufficient reason is not discernible in a necessary absence of all faith in his promises, is an opinion which a large class of even Tory and high-church reasoners have not been ashamed to adopt from the late Mr. Coleridge. To renew anything like the vehemency of the old civil war disputes, therefore, let us assure Mr. Bankes, it is now become needful to pass to a 'more removed ground.' His ancestor was in his grave, and his ancestor's correspondents diversely and sadly scattered; my Lord Northumberland was sulking at his country-house, Mr.

personal authority, the means of government have broken from him; and, failing as a sovereign, he cannot further succeed as a ruler. Difficulties without have accumulated, as perplexities within increased; and his once lofty thoughts and aspirations have sunk into restless provisions for personal safety. The day which released his great spirit, therefore, the anniversary of his victories of Worcester and Dunbar, was to be held still his 'Fortunate Day' for the sake of the death it brought, not less than it was so held of old for the triumphs it associated with his name.

The third stands apart from both of these, and may be taken as the expression of certain absolute results, to which a study of the entire of Cromwell's letters and speeches, brought into succinct arrangement and connexion, has been able to bring an earnest inquirer. We may thus describe them. That in the harsh untuneable voice which rose in protest against popery in the third parliament, was heard at once the complete type and the noblest development of what was meant by the Puritan Rebellion. That there then broke forth the utterance of a true man, of a consistency of character perfect to a heroic degree, and whose figure has heretofore been completely distorted by the mists of time and prepossession through which we have looked back at it into the past. That *this* Cromwell was no hypocrite or actor of plays, had no vanity or pride in the prodigious intellect he possessed, was no theorist in politics or government, was no victim of ambition, was no seeker after sovereignty or temporal power. That he was a man whose every thought was with the Eternal,—a man of a great, robust, massive mind, and of an honest; stout, English heart; subject to melancholy for the most part, because of the deep yearnings of his soul for the sense of divine forgiveness, but inflexible and resolute always, because in all things governed by the supreme law. That in him was seen a man whom no fear but of the divine anger could distract; whom no honour in man's bestowal could seduce or betray; who knew the duty of the hour to be ever imperative, and who sought only to do the work, whatever it might be, whereunto he believed God to have called him. That here was one of those rare souls which could lay upon itself the lowliest and the highest functions alike, and find itself, in them all, self-contained and sufficient,—the dutiful gentle son, the quiet country gentleman, the sportive tender husband, the fond father, the active soldier, the daring political leader, the powerful sovereign,—under each aspect still steady and unmoved to the transient outward appearances of this world, still wrestling and trampling forward to the sublime hopes of

Interpersa: Johnston's Public Library.

Acq. No.

7519

Date

23.7.75

another, and passing through every instant of its term of life as through a Marston Moor, a Worcester, a Dunbar. That such a man could not have consented to take part in public affairs under any compulsion less strong than that of conscience. That his business in them was to serve the Lord, and to bring his country under subjection to God's laws. That if the statesmen of the republic who had laboured and fought with him, could not also see their way to that prompt sanctification of their country, he did well to strike them from his path, and unrelentingly denounce or imprison them. That he felt, unless his purpose were so carried out unflinchingly, a curse would be upon him; that no act necessitated by it could be other than just and noble; and that there could be no treason against royalty or liberty, unless it were also treason against God. That, finally, as he had lived he died, in the conviction that human laws were nothing unless brought into agreement with divine laws, and that the temporal must also mean the spiritual government of man.

And now, with these three aspects of the same character before us, we may perhaps better measure the view which M. Guizot takes of Cromwell. Something of the first will be found in it, of the second decidedly yet more; and though it has nothing of the remorse with which both cloud the latter days of the Protector, it expresses the same sense of failure and loss, and stops with a faltering step far short of where his last and warmest panegyrist would place him. Free and unhesitating, nevertheless, is its admiration of his genius and greatness, and earnest and unshrinking the sympathy expressed with his courage and his practical aims. It would seem to be the view too exclusively of a statesman and a man of the world, of one who has lived too near to revolutions, and suffered from them too much, always to see them in their right proportions, to measure them patiently by their own laws, or adjust them fairly to their settled meaning and ultimate design. But there is nothing in it which is petty or unjust,—nothing that is unworthy of a high clear intellect.

A great man, then, but enamoured of this world's substantial greatness, is M. Guizot's Cromwell. All that was noble in his mind, and all that was little, he was able to subordinate to the lust of material dominion. But where that passion led him, there also lay what he believed to be his duty; and if, in the pursuit of it, he suffered no principle of right to be a barrier upon his path, neither did he suffer any mists of petty vanity to cloud his perfect view of whatever hard or flinty road might lie before him. To govern, says M. Guizot, that was his design. The business of his life was to arrive at government, and to

maintain himself in it; his enemies were those who would throw any bar or hindrance in the way of this; and, excepting those whom he used as its agents, he had no friends. Such a man was Cromwell, if he be judged rightly by the French historian. He was a great and a successful, but an unscrupulous man. With equal success he attempted and accomplished the most opposite enterprises. During eighteen years a leading actor in the business of the world, and always in the character of victor, he by turns scattered disorder and established order, excited revolution and chastised it, overthrew the government and raised it again. At each moment, in each situation, he unravelled with a wonderful sagacity the passions and the interests that happened to be dominant; and, twisting all their threads into his own web of policy, he clothed himself with their authority, and knew how to identify with theirs his own dominion. Always bent upon one great aim, he spurned any charge of inconsistency in the means by which he pursued it. His past might at any time belie his present, but for that he cared little. He steered his bark according to the wind that blew; and however the prow might point at one time and another, it was enough for him if he could ride the stormy waters of the revolution, and make quick voyage without shipwreck to the harbour beyond. The oneness of his aim was the consistency that covered any incoherence in the conduct of his enterprise. His work was good if it attained its crown. His seamanship was creditable if it took him safely across to the desired port, — port royal.

Not that this expressed in him any mean or low desire for a merely selfish aggrandisement. It is a main point in M. Guizot's judgment of the character of Cromwell, that he holds him to have been a man who felt, quite as distinctly as M. Guizot himself feels, an absence of practical sense in even the noblest system that is revolutionary. He was thoroughly aware that a people like the English, reverent of law, though they might crush a king by whom the law had been defied, would nevertheless remain true in their hearts to the principle of monarchy. When he proposed, therefore, finally to stand before the English as their sovereign, the Cromwell of M. Guizot was but shaping his ambition by the spirit of the nation he sought to rule. His soul was too great to be satisfied with a mere personal success. To become a constitutional king was only his last aim but one. His last, and the dearest object of his life, was to transmit a crown and sceptre, as their birthright, to succeeding members of his family. He was a man, however, who could conquer but not found. He conquered much more than the power of king of England, but also much less than the

name; and while his own wish, and the genius of the nation, were begetting parliaments, and not an effort was left unattempted by him to put off his absolutist habits, and to live within the means of a ruler accountable to Lords and Commons, these were the only labours of his life in which he failed. To substitute for a weak house of Stuart a strong house of Cromwell, at the gate of the great temple of the constitution, was, if M. Guizot be right in his view, the noblest aim of the Protectorate. But herein the Protector failed; and the historian to whom disorder is the synonym for revolution, closes with this sentence the '*Histoire de la République d'Angleterre et de Cromwell* :'

'God does not grant to the great men who have set on disorder the foundations of their greatness, the power to regulate at their pleasure and for centuries, even according to their better desires, the government of nations.' *

That is the moral of the book; and it may be well that the reader should see, before we proceed further, how the few simple and pregnant words composing it are given in the English version. For M. Guizot has found an authorised translator whose endeavour has been 'to make as literal a translation as was compatible with our English idiom;' and the sentence, which translates literally as above, is accommodated in manner following to the English idiom: 'God does not grant to those great men who have laid the foundation of their greatness amidst disorder and revolution, the power of regulating at their pleasure, and for succeeding ages, the government of nations.' Of which sentence the accommodation to English idiom will be seen mainly to consist in the addition of 'and revolution' to 'disorder,' whereby it is implied in the English that the two things are different, whereas it is in the spirit of the French to assume that they are like; and in the entire omission of the very pregnant clause by which both the summary of Cromwell's ambition is qualified to his credit, and the moral the historian would draw from it is pointedly enforced, namely, that in the opinion of M. Guizot, even designs that might seem well worthy of completion are frustrated by the divine wisdom, when disorder is used as a step to their accomplishment.

* '*Dieu n'accorde pas aux grands hommes qui ont posé dans le desordre les fondements de leur grandeur, le pouvoir de régler, à leur gré et pour des siècles, même selon leurs meilleurs désirs, le gouvernement des nations.*'

As it is in this opening sentence, however, so is it, we regret to say, through almost every part of the work of the translator; and since we have interrupted ourselves to say so much, we may as well delay the reader a little longer to prove it. For it is surely to be regretted that a history like this by M. Guizot, a book so especially interesting to Englishmen that a place was at once ready in our permanent literature for a good translation of it, should have failed to find the proper care and attention in this respect. If books were to be swallowed like water, with no regard to the mere pleasure of the taste, it would matter little; but there is a style in writing as there is a bouquet in wine, and if M. Guizot's be a little thin, it is yet pure, refined, and sparkling, with a delicate aroma. As he presents it to us, it is never flat or insipid; but from M. Guizot's flask to his translator's bucket is a lamentable plunge, and whatever spirit the original possessed we find dissipated in the transfer. A reconstruction into verbose, round-in-the-mouth sentences, is the utter destruction of M. Guizot's French. The sense comes muffled, as though the voice reached you through a feather bed. Let any one who cares to be at so much trouble read separately this book and its translation, and he will be surprised to find how much is lost when style is lost. The two versions leave absolutely different impressions of the author's mind.

Without any special search for glaring instances, we will begin at the beginning. We will take the first dozen pages (written when the translator, fresh to his work, could hardly have begun to slip through weariness), and see what has been made of them. Why, the very title has been altered in significance. M. Guizot wrote *History of the Commonwealth of England and of Cromwell*, and this the translator brings into compatibility with English idiom by writing *History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth*. It does not occur to him that there may be sense, no less than sound, in the order of the words placed upon his title-page by the historian. His problem is to impart what he conceives to be an easy flow to a given number of vocables; and if for him they flow better upside down than straightforward, they are, as in this title, inverted accordingly.

It is a noticeable peculiarity of M. Guizot, that in characterising historical persons he shows himself prone to dwell on the contradictory appearances assumed by the same nature of a man. Whenever it is possible, he marks the two sides which belong to human character, and the ease with which opposite opinions may with no dishonesty be formed. Of this there is of course no example in his book, or in the whole range of

human history, so prominent as Cromwell himself; and as all opposite qualities maintain the balance of an active mind, the temptation is great to the historian to bring out the expression of such contrasts in a strong antithesis. So strong generally in M. Guizot, indeed, is this form of speech, that it takes but the least additional strain to turn it into nonsense; and not seldom his translator goes far to effect this. He cannot give simply even such an epithet as 'the lustre of their actions and their destiny,' in the very first sentence, 'l'éclat de leur actions et de leur destinée,' without turning it into 'the splendour of their actions and the magnitude of their destiny.'

The history begins with a picture of the Long Parliament under its republican chiefs, reduced in number by secessions following the execution of the king, and regarded without sympathy by the main body of the nation. In the February following the execution, there were not more than seventy-seven members who recorded votes at any of the divisions, and of these divisions M. Guizot counts eight. The translator alters this into ten, without a note to indicate the change. The parliamentary leaders, M. Guizot continues, set to work, 'avec une ardeur pleine en même temps de foi et d'inquiétude:' a hint of the secret disquiet at the heart of theorists committed to action, which in the translation loses both subtlety and sense by the exaggeration of disquiet into anxiety, and by the yoking of an adjective to each noun for the more dignified and sonorous roll of the period. They set to work, says the translator, with an ardour full 'at once of strong faith and deep anxiety.' Enter thus upon the sentence the words strong and deep, and exeunt from the sense of it the things strength and depth.

Forty-one councillors of state were presently appointed, and among those chosen, says M. Guizot, there were five superior magistrates, and twenty-eight country gentlemen and citizens: but these numbers, again without a note to say that he is not translating, the translator alters, one into three, the other into thirty. When these councillors met, continues the historian, they were required to sign an engagement approving of all that had been done 'in the king's trial, and in the abolition of monarchy and of the House of Lords:' but this expression is too simple for the translator, who words it and double words it, 'in the king's trial, in the overthrow of kingship, and in the abolition of the House of Lords.' Twenty-two, proceeds M. Guizot, persisted 'à le repousser;' but this word of spirit vanishes from the translation, where it is said, in the interest of English idiom, that they persisted 'in refusing it.' The substance of their reasons, adds M. Guizot, the tone of his mind

insensibly colouring his expression, was that they 'refused to 'associate themselves' with the past; but heavily clouded is this hint of a personal stain, and of the dread of complicity, when the translator turns it into 'refused to give their sanction.' Excited by the censure so implied, resumes M. Guizot, the House nevertheless checked its own resentment, ('on ne 'voulut pas faire éclater les dissensions des républicains;') and here his temperate and subtle tone again directs attention to the weakness of the theoretical republicans, in the fact that they did not wish to publish abroad their dissensions. But the entire sense of it is lost by the translator, who thus again words and double words and smothers it in idiom. 'To originate dissensions among the republicans would, it was felt, be madness.' There is already discord in the camp, suggests M. Guizot. Discord, suggests his translator, had yet to begin, and these were not men mad enough to set it going. The translator may be right, but he is not translating M. Guizot.

The historian still pursues his theme. 'Les régicides com-
'prirent qu'ils seraient trop faibles s'ils restaient seuls;' but that the translation might become 'too weak' indeed, the simple words 'trop faibles' are multiplied into the idiomatic English of 'not strong enough to maintain their position.' The matter was accordingly arranged, says M. Guizot, 'sans plus de 'bruit.' Hushed-up would be no bad idiom for that; but unfortunately hushed-up would mean what M. Guizot means, and so, says the translator, it was arranged 'without further diffi-
'culty.' Significantly M. Guizot adds, of the modified pledge offered by the dissidents, that with it 'on se contenta;' which insignificantly the translator renders 'it was accepted.'

These are small items of criticism, it will be said. But let it be understood that the last seven of them all arise out of a single paragraph, and that the last six are all on the same page; and let any one conceive what murder is done upon the soul of a book, 700 pages long, when a translator sits down in this manner to the work of killing it by inches.

We turn over, and on the first line of the next page read that the compromise described was 'to a very great extent' the work of Cromwell and Sir Henry Vane: 'to a very great extent' being the translator's idiom for 'surtout.' Before we get to the middle of the page we find a date set down as November, without any note of its having been written December in the text. On the first line of the next page, Vane's suggestion of an oath of fidelity simply referring to the future is spoken of as an idea whereof Cromwell was one of the most eager 'to express his 'entire approval:' the translator in that supplying his peculiar

idiom for 'à s'en contenter.' Similarly we find, in the sentence following, that for 'nul' the English idiom is 'no one' for a 'moment.' Of the committee of three who held the powers of the Admiralty, M. Guizot says that Vane 'était l'âme,' and his translator says (diluting it into his idiom) that Vane 'was the chief.' Blake then enters on the scene, by whom, according to M. Guizot, the glory of the Commonwealth at sea was heretofore 'à faire;' and this expression is rendered 'to augment,' that its spirit may be utterly destroyed.

We promised to comment on the first dozen pages of the authorised English version of M. Guizot's Commonwealth and Cromwell, and if we redeem our promise we must discuss four more. Rather than do that, we will break it. But we quote from both texts the beginning of page nine; the English water side by side with the French wine; and we think no reader who examines it will desire that we should splash on through the rest of this page, or the pages following. The passage, feeble as it is, is far above the average; for in it the sense of the text does absolutely survive what the translator overlays it with, though in what condition the reader will see.

'La chambre avait touché et pourvu à tout; la législation, la diplomatie, la justice, la police, les finances, l'armée, la flotte étaient dans ses mains. Pour paraître aussi désintéressée qu'elle était active, elle admit les membres qui s'étaient séparés du parti vainqueur, au moment de sa rupture définitive avec le roi, à reprendre leur place dans ses rangs, mais en leur imposant un tel désaveu de leurs anciens votes que bien peu d'entre eux purent s'y résoudre.'

'The house had revised and arranged every department of the administration; the legislation and diplomacy of the country, the courts of justice, the police, the finances, the army and the fleet, were all in its hands. To appear as disinterested as it was active, it permitted those members who had separated from the conquering party, at the moment of its definitive rupture with the king, to resume their seats in its midst; but it required from them at the same time such a disavowal of their former votes, that very few could persuade themselves to take advantage of this concession.'

Such is the translation which M. Guizot has unfortunately authorised, and which the law now protects against any better that might replace it. The example should not be thrown away. It is an evil, but ought not to be a necessary evil, of the protection given under international copyright, that if a book be marred in the translation, it is marred past hope of mending. The new law is not less politic than it is just, for without it there can be no inducement sufficient to invite to such labour

the employment of original talents and real learning. But if, through want of care in obtaining these, incapacity is now employed and protected, mischief beyond retrieval is done. Foreign writers cannot be too careful: what an engraver is in the eyes of an artist, a translator should be in the eyes of an author; and while, in the former case, our academicians have been lately yielding, to the most eminent in the craft, a right of brotherhood, in the latter the best masters have, at all times been esteemed, by authors of repute, as brother craftsmen. If publishers are indisposed to the same view, the public should protect themselves. Copyright in translation will involve grave injury to them, if it lowers instead of raising the average of translating ability by lowering the prices paid for it. To give no more under the new law to the author and the translator than under the old was given to the translator alone, is to mistake altogether the object of a change which was meant to increase the facilities for properly remunerating both, by protecting translations of a really high character from unequal rivalry with the indifferent or utterly worthless. We invite to the subject, therefore, a more minute attention than it has hitherto been customary to give to it. A more exacting criticism of translation as translation may at least check the incapable with some fear of censure, and cheer on the work of the really able with some small hope of a just fame.

The lights and shades of style indicate the bias of an author's mind. In describing their effacement from the English version of this history, we have found also means to indicate what, in M. Guizot's case, the bias is. What it is, it could hardly fail to be. It requires but the opening sentence of the volumes* to

* 'J'ai raconté la chute d'une ancienne monarchie et la mort violente d'un roi digne de respect, quoiqu'il ait mal et injustement gouverné ses peuples. J'ai maintenant à raconter les vains efforts d'une assemblée révolutionnaire pour fonder une république, et le gouvernement toujours chancelant, bien que fort et glorieux, d'un despote révolutionnaire, admirable par son hardi et judicieux génie, quoiqu'il ait attaqué et détruit, dans son pays, d'abord l'ordre légal, puis la liberté. Les hommes que Dieu prend pour instruments de ses grands desseins sont pleins de contradiction et de mystère: il mêle et unit en eux, dans des proportions profondément cachées, les qualités et les défauts, les vertus et les vices, les lumières et les erreurs, les grandeurs et les faiblesses; et après avoir rempli leur temps de l'éclat de leurs actions et de leur destinée, ils demeurent eux-mêmes obscurs au sein de leur gloire, encensés et maudits tour à tour par le monde qui ne les connaît pas.'

reveal to us that the feelings of the writer are here more nearly touched than they had been by the former portion of his narrative. His account of our revolution down to the king's execution was given in a style as calm as it was clear ; but where he has before him only the men of the Republic, though he is still philosophical, still to the utmost of his ability a righteous judge, there is yet a ripple before unseen on the surface of his judgment. The statesman who has connected his own name in history with endeavours to preserve a king and a constitution, and who nevertheless saw king and constitution swept away to make room for an ephemeral republic, holds fast still by a restricted monarchy as not merely the best form of government, but, so to speak, as his own cause, and regards a republic with some sense of personal antagonism. The open expression of this, indeed, is as far as possible subdued ; but not less is it discernible.

Sixty-one years ago a high-spirited young lawyer died at Nîmes on the scaffold, sentenced to death for his dislike of a republic by a court obedient to the French Republican Convention. That young man, twenty-seven years old when his life was taken, was the father of M. Guizot. The latter was only a boy of seven at the time, but old enough to receive into his soul undying recollection of the murder in the name of liberty that made a widow of his mother. The decree which took away the father's life and confiscated his possessions, ordered also that his children,—the boy just named, and another little son,—should be committed to the Foundling Hospital, and brought up in accordance with a revolutionary law. But their mother, a noble woman, whom her eldest-born, then become a statesman and historian of European fame, saw grieving after fifty years of widowhood with fresh tears for the husband of her youth, took them with the wreck of her fortune out of France, and dwelt with them for six years at Geneva, watching carefully their education. Father and mother had been pious Protestants, firm against the pressure of religious persecution ; and, open to all grave and noble influences, M. Guizot's boyhood at Geneva was full of the promise which his manhood has long since more than fulfilled. By the reflective tone of his mind, by his skill in reasoning, by a surprising aptitude for the acquisition of languages, and by a taste for historical inquiry, even so early he distinguished himself. Sent at the age of eighteen as a law student to Paris, his abilities were quickly recognised by men ready to turn them to account. His pen was soon brought into use, and his literary talents as well as industry were displayed in the publication by him, at the age of twenty-two, of his well-

known *Dictionary of Synonymes*. He had begun at the same time the arduous enterprise of a translation of Gibbon, with original notes; and so prompt was the recognition of his manifest ability; that at the age of twenty-four he was made Professor of Modern History at the Faculty of Letters.

Through all the troubles of France during the years that ensued, M. Guizot, known as a man of the future, steadily maintained his position as a calm antagonist of whatever he believed to be anarchy. Between republican and despot in the days of Bonaparte or Charles X., with a moral courage free from display of passion, he held firm to the lesson of his life which study had strengthened in him, that the quiet reign of a constitutional king, upon a system liberally conservative, is the condition of prosperity and peace for the French people, or for any people fairly civilised. Order, with liberty, was his creed in those days; as to the present it has remained his belief that liberty must be protected by order. One of his first political pamphlets was upon Representative Government, another was upon the mode of conducting government and opposition. One of the first inquiries into which he launched was a discovery for himself of the origin and causes of our great Revolution. He published a history of it to the death of Charles I.; and with a spirit and enterprise which has yet found no parallel in England, he completed, in no less than twenty-six octavo volumes, a translated collection of memoirs and histories relating to it. As a writer, we should not omit to add, his first commanding success was won by his elaborate lectures on the origin of Representative Government in Europe, delivered at the temporary cost of his chair when France sorely needed reliable and wise information on that matter.

At last came the revolution of 1830, and there was placed upon the French throne a ruler whose most selfish interest it plainly was, not merely to offer a determined resistance to democratic passion, but to establish a government that should be in its nature both conservative and liberal: enough of the latter to be safe, enough of the former to satisfy European statesmen. In such a course there was no man in France so fit to counsel the King and serve the country as M. Guizot. The student of history, so skilful and dispassionate, became accordingly Minister of Interior to Louis Philippe; he gave his earnest support, though out of office, to the Ministry of Casimir Perier, and afterwards held the Ministry of Public Instruction for nearly five years, between 1832 and 1837; during the summer of 1840, was Ambassador in England; at the close of that year formed the Ministry in which he took the

office of Foreign Affairs, but of which he was the virtual head; and finally, on the death of Marshal Soult, in September 1847, became its nominal as well as actual chief, and Prime Minister of France. The beginning of his new career was employed in decisive suppression of all active revolutionary opposition to the newly-established monarchy. The middle of it saw him the successful founder of a system of national education for his countrymen, far better than anything of a similar kind hitherto attempted in Great Britain. And it is quite possible that the close of it might have placed within his power the salvation of the French throne, if, in the critical hour, a failing king had not forsaken his counsels. Monarchy fell; and the same republican wrath which had destroyed his father again beat and surged round the monarchist statesman. But whatever his failures, in theory or in action, M. Guizot never failed in probity. He never flinched from the trial of his principles; never fell from his oaths or his professions; never in his public conduct abated a jot from the work demanded of him in his secret conscience. There have been many greater statesmen, but few so altogether free from moral stain.

Yet in his own country, where republicanism has been identified with revolution, there has been no man, with of course one exception, against whom so much ill has been spoken by republicans. From them he has endured, for many of the last years of his life as a statesman, the incessant sting of calumny. In resuming at its close, therefore, the story of a short-lived republic, he has before him the moral of the creed which for sixty years has been his private and his public enemy. Not for this reason, however, which the true scholar's spirit would disown, does he now, after the storm of his active life is over, return to the study of the revolution which earliest engaged his attention; but because, being complete, unlike that in progress and still undetermined in France, it admits of a perfect scrutiny, and offers most prospect of historical instruction. The 'History of the Commonwealth and Cromwell' is the second of the four parts into which he divides it (the third being that of 'Richard Cromwell,' of which, by the favour of the author, the early portion is also before us); and remembering that the very pulse of its author's life beats in it, we may well be surprised to find its stroke so regular and calm.

Far from reviling our historical republicans, whose high-minded endeavours he has quite nobility enough to understand, M. Guizot points out that the experiment they made was not in their time associated with any of those ideas of mere revolt

and lawlessness which have lately been connected with such attempts. Under honourable forms only, as in Italy, Switzerland, or the Netherlands, was republican government then known; and the attempt to convert the English monarchy into a republic, was, to put his idea into plain words, such an experiment as decent men might put their hands to. In the eyes of continental nations it had also a religious aspect; and though he believes it, as a republican movement, to have been a mistake, he not the less believes that but for the violence necessarily incident to the transition from a kingdom to a commonwealth, the scheme might have been a successful one. But, in his judgment, a republic founded upon revolution finds its works soon clogged by that property in its founders, which, calling itself and thinking itself republican zeal, is in reality nothing but revolutionary obstinacy.

Thus, as might have been expected, M. Guizot is too accurate a thinker to condemn wholly as theory that scheme of government, in the practical establishment of which both England and France, each in its own manner and degree, have failed. Every way worthy of notice, indeed, is the reflection with which he opens the third section of his labours, when, in the narrative of Richard Cromwell and his troubles, following upon that of Richard's father and his triumphs, he is about to relate the career of the revived Long Parliament. A republic, he says, when it is, among any people, the natural and true result of its social state, of its ideas and of its manners, is a Government worthy of all sympathy and respect. It may have its vices, theoretical and practical, but it honours and serves humanity, because it stimulates it to the mustering of its great moral forces, and can lift it to a very high degree of dignity and virtue, of prosperity and glory. But a Republic, untimely and factitious, foreign to the national history and manners, introduced and sustained by pride of spirit and the egotism of faction, is a government detestable in itself, for it is full of falsehood and violence; and has, moreover, this deplorable consequence, that it discredits in the minds of nations the principles of political right and the guarantees of liberty, by the false application and the tyrannical use to which they are put, or the hypocritical violation they are made to suffer. Hostile to all crude attempts at the establishment of a Republic, therefore, still no unfair measure, we are glad to say, is dealt out by the French statesman to our republican forefathers. That after all they should have failed principally because their hopes were pitched too high, is not a fact which such a man can dismiss with indifference, whatever

his sense of the needs of practical statesmanship may be. He rather, Frenchman as he is, rejoices to show them to us with Mazarin hat in hand before them; spurning the fair outside of civility with which the wily Italian would have approached them; and finally bringing him to a frank submission, while the Queen Mother gnashes her teeth at the recognition of 'these infamous traitors.'

In illustration of the kind of men whom the traitors sought out for employment, too, there stands a somewhat memorable record in their Council Book, which we can conceive appealing to M. Guizot with the same sort of interest it still possesses for Englishmen, notwithstanding his too manifest predilection for those powers only 'which are based upon right and sanctioned by time.' It is the official notice of Sir Harry Vane's and Mr. Marten's visit, one March evening in 1649, armed with the authority of the Council of State of which they were members, to 'the lodging of Mr. John Milton, in a small house in Holborn, which opens backwards into Lincoln's Inn Fields, to speak to Mr. Milton, to know, Whether he will be employed as Secretary for the Foreign Languages? and to report to the Council.' We may feel quite sure that M. Guizot would think none the worse of the Council for this little circumstance, though we cannot quite satisfy ourselves as to the authority with which he describes the Lord Protector profiting by Milton's genius and ascendancy, and continuing to use the talents thus placed at his official disposal, but putting no faith in the wisdom of their wondrous possessor; supplying him with funds to afford liberal hospitality at his house and table in Whitehall to such foreign men of letters as came to visit England, but admitting him, while chief of the State, into no personal intimacy, and studiously withholding from him all public influence. Such may have been the relations of Milton and Cromwell; but we do not know the authority on which the statement rests, and what we know of the circumstances attending the interference for the Vaudois would lead us to entertain some doubt of it.

Milton is M. Guizot's ideal of the highest of the republican statesmen, grand, but unpractical. He depicts him revelling in a dream of liberty, and taking pleasure as a poet in sublime thoughts and majestic words, without inquiring whether the world's every-day life held within it any answer to such aspirations. In his case, according to M. Guizot, abstract reasoning so far misguided a noble heart*, a passionate and dreamy intellect,

* 'Un noble cœur,' says M. Guizot. 'A stern but noble heart,' says his translator.

as to render his wisdom of less service than it might have been in the actual conduct of affairs. And as with him, so with the other statesmen of the Commonwealth — scholastic, theoretical republicans; in their way, too, in regard to much they took in hand, mere high-minded dreamers; and possessed, according to a foolish homely phrase, of every sense but common sense. Yet is it the belief of M. Guizot, that for the most part with a dignified reserve and an intelligent prudence, these adventurous statesmen entered upon their work. The country coldly supported them, indeed, and abroad they were detested; nevertheless, as they well knew, they were not menaced, and they had otherwise much upon their side. Men of high integrity — men such as Sydney, Ludlow, Marten, Hutchinson, Harrington — men of even high administrative ability such as Vane, — they were impassioned on behalf of their cause, and swayed by no other interest than that of seeing it triumph. The cause itself, too, though ‘*peu sensée et antipathique au pays,*’ was noble and moral; for the principles presiding over it were a faith in truth, and an affectionate esteem for humanity, respect for its rights, and the desire for its free and glorious development. But the historian thinks it was also incident to their very position that many errors should be committed, and that a too prolonged enjoyment of power in the midst of chaos should prove disastrous to some among themselves. And he shows, from the secret correspondence of the agents of Mazarin, what a number of city people there were, like a certain respectable merchant and news-writer, Mr. Morrell, eager for any sort of change, tired of a multiplicity of masters, and ready to hope better things from one than from a hundred, — ‘greater secrecy, more promptitude, less speechifying, more work.’ In a word, three great causes were surely and steadily conspiring to the fall of the republic. There was matter both corrupt and obstructive in its lower divisions; there was a nation reverent of law heavily and surely swaying back to monarchy; and, worse than all, the very heart of the republican ranks held within it a leader in their army, a man mighty in battle, born with an instinct of command, born with a genius for government, eminently practical, and utterly unscrupulous. That is M. Guizot’s Cromwell.

A man who had the pitiless sagacity to see the worth of an enemy only to recognise the necessity of at once putting him out of the way, he was able not less, in the judgment of the French historian, to conceal effectually his own pride and pretensions, and carry exposed upon his sleeve only an irresistible semblance of self-denial. ‘No great man,’ exclaims M. Guizot, ‘ever carried the hypocrisy of modesty so far as Cromwell, or so easily

‘subordinated his vanity to his ambition.’ So little also can M. Guizot discover of system in his mind, so little does he find him under the influence of preconceived ideas of any kind, that he believes him to have had no really fixed principles at all on questions civil or religious. But though he was not a philosopher, and did not act in obedience to systematic and premeditated views, he was guided by the superior instinct and practical good sense of a man destined by the hand of God to govern; and he possessed, above all, that consummate secret of the art which consists in a just appreciation of what will be sufficient in every given circumstance, and in resting satisfied with it. He had, moreover, an unerring instinct of the drift of the people by which he brought them to his side; and the historian thinks it an extreme proof of the relations he maintained, and the hopes he inspired, among persons of all ranks and creeds, that he should have been able to suggest himself as their best resource, not simply to sectaries of all sorts,—Unitarians, Jews, Muggletonians, and Freethinkers, but even to Roman Catholics and Episcopalians. Giving credit to the earliest reports which represent him as by councils and conversations feeling his way towards the dignity of King, it was yet, according to M. Guizot, his rare faculty throughout to understand the *ne quid nimis* in the art of government; and acting upon it, bitter as the trial was, he finally denied himself the crown. He possessed, says the historian, the two qualities that make men great: he was sensible, and he was bold; indomitable in his hopes, yet never the victim of illusion.

What is thus said of the absence of system in Cromwell’s ambition, let us remark, finds such striking illustration in a passage of the Cardinal de Retz’s memoirs that we are surprised it should have escaped M. Guizot. Having occasion to quote the description from that very clever book of Vane’s secret mission from Cromwell and the Council of State immediately after the victory of Worcester, when the Cardinal found the envoy a man of such ‘surprising capacity,’* the historian should not have laid down the volume, we think, without reproducing from a somewhat later page one of the shrewdest of all its hints for statesmen, embodied in the following memorable dialogue. The Cardinal is talking, during Crom-

* An admission, we may observe, of which the French editors have hitherto done their best to deprive the great English republican by invariably printing his name (even down to the last and best edition of MM. Michard and Poujoulat, which restores the suppressed passages, and from which we quote,) as *Vaire, Vere, or Vaine*.

well's protectorate, with the First President of the Parliament of Paris, M. de Bellièvre. 'I understand you,' says the President at a particular point of their argument, 'and I stop you at the same time to tell you what I have learnt from Cromwell.' (M. de Bellièvre, interposes the Cardinal, had seen and known him in England). 'He said to me one day, that *One never mounted so high as when one did not know where one was going.*' Whereupon says the Cardinal to the President, 'You know that I have a horror of Cromwell; but however great a man they may think him I add to this, contempt, for if that be his opinion he seems to me to be a fool.' The Cardinal proceeds to tell us that he reports this dialogue, which is nothing in itself, to make us see the importance of never speaking of people who are in great posts. For Monsieur the President, returning to his cabinet where there were several people, repeated the remark without reflection, as a proof of the injustice which was done their friend the Cardinal when it was said that *his* ambition was without measure and without bounds. All which was straightway carried off to my Lord Protector of England, who remembered it with bitterness, and took occasion not long after to say to M. de Bordeaux, the Ambassador of France at his Court, *I know only one man in the world who despises me, and that is Cardinal de Retz.* 'This opinion,' adds the penitent Cardinal, 'had very nearly cost me dear.'

The truth is, that Cromwell's remark by no means deserved the contemptuous comment of De Retz. It is not at all so necessary, as the Cardinal appears to think, that a man who is about to mount high should have systematically arranged beforehand to what exact height he shall mount. It may be true that in all ambitious men there will necessarily be some calculation, and something of a preconceived plan; but it may be fairly doubted whether to constitute such a man of the first order there must not also be a yet larger amount of passion to outstrip and go beyond the calculation. In short, to whatever extent particular plans and arrangements may contribute immediately to success, it must ever be a condition of the highest success not to be finally bound by them. Within the fixity of all men's designs and the uncertainty of their destiny, there is an interval so large and vague, that it is there the highest order of genius will probably most often find its occasions and means, its power and opportunity; and we think it very certain that wherever the highest has been reached to which it was possible to attain, the courage to undergo a risk must at least have been as great as the patience to profit by a plan. We go farther in Cromwell's case, for we are very certain he began with no plan

at all but a zeal for what he honestly believed to be God's truth, and for the establishment of a government that should be according to God's will.

Who that is at all acquainted with his entire history will believe, that when the final summons of array reached him on his farm at Ely, he knew, as he buckled on his sword, whither he was going? He had lived for more than forty years the useful unassuming life from which he was then called away, cultivating his native acres in those eastern fens, tilling the earth, reading his Bible, assisting persecuted preachers, and himself kneeling daily with his servants around him in exhortation and prayer. He was by birth a gentleman, as he described himself ten years later to the first parliament of the Protectorate, living at no great height, nor yet in obscurity. He had not been without the means, that is, of challenging distinction, if such had been his wish. He had been dragged before the Privy Council* without claiming the honours of a martyr, and had led an agitation against the great lords of his county without aspiring to the rewards of a hero. In resisting a particular grievance he had made himself the most popular and powerful man in all that district of the fens; but satisfied when the work was done, he had sought no further advantage from the popularity and power acquired in doing it. Certainly this, too, is the character of all his early exploits in the war. All that appears essential to him is that he must actually *do* the work he has in hand, and to this he is bent exclusively. When, in conversation with his cousin Hampden at the close of the first doubtful year of the conflict, he threw out the remark which contained the germ of all his subsequent victories, who will believe that his thoughts were travelling beyond the duty and necessity of the hour? His experience in the field had taught him why it was the Royalists gained upon their adversaries in battle, and he at once declared that it would not do to go on enlisting 'poor tapsters and 'town-apprentice people' against well-born cavaliers, but that to cope with men of honour, men of religion must be enrolled. When he expressed this design to Hampden, it might be said that, on the instant, the whole issue of the war was determined; but is it necessary to suppose him carrying his own thoughts so far? When he proceeded to organise his God-fearing regiment

* This curious and hitherto unknown incident in his career was lately discovered in a search among the registers of the Privy Council by one of the most intelligent and able antiquaries now living, Mr. John Bruce, and by him communicated to the '*Athenæum*' of the 13th of October, 1855.

of Ironsides, is it conceivable that he cared or was troubled to anticipate to what a destiny they might bear himself? Clarendon has made it a reproach against him that on one occasion he said he could tell what he would *not* have, but not what he would have; but was not this only another expression of the thought that he had no concern but the duty of the hour, no wish but to do it *in* the hour, and that he knew not and cared not whither it might lead him?

As time went on, indeed, as he commanded armies, won battles, and saw himself indisputably the first soldier and captain of his time, to direct and govern men became doubtless as much a part of no longer avoidable duty, as any commonest avocation that had occupied him on his Ely farm. With this too, let it also be admitted, there must of course have opened upon him that wider range of worldly opportunities to which, whether they shape themselves to ambition or any other inclination of the mind, it is so easy to give the name, or to make available under the sanction, of duty itself. Doubtless to many such temptations Cromwell yielded. In his religious creed he is said (we must confess on what seems to us doubtful authority) to have held the somewhat dangerous doctrine, that having once been in a state of grace it was not possible to fall from it; and from time to time, if this were so, it must insensibly have relaxed to him even the restraints of religion itself. But that there was any conscious hypocrisy in his language, or any settled scheme of mere ambition in his conduct, we find it difficult to believe. Higher and higher as he was mounting, still to the last he might have asked himself *Whither*. When at the close of the war he appears heaped with all the favours a grateful people and parliament could bestow, there is yet not one which had not fallen to him naturally, or that it would not have been monstrous as well as foolish to deny to him. Every step of the ascent had been solidly and laboriously won; he stood upon it as of right; and surely no man ever rose so high with less of what we may call usurpation. In the honours paid him, in the very triumphs of state thrown over him, when he left London upon his campaign and returned with the final victory, there was not a man in the popular ranks, of however rigid and ascetic public virtue, who might not feel that he was also himself participating as in a gain and glory of his own. When the Lord General passed out of the city in his coach, drawn by six gallant Flander's mares, whitish gray, and 'with colonels for his life-guard' such as the world might not parallel, it may be very doubtful if less would have satisfied the most exacting republican claims and whose power he then and there represented. What

he returned in a more than regal triumph, receiving homage from the populace, halting to hawk with the gentry, and presenting horses and prisoners to the parliamentary delegates appointed to give him welcome, it was yet but the glory of their common country which all men were content to see reflected in the ceremony and the pomp which surrounded him.

Should it be matter of blame, then, that still he rose to the occasion which called him, and even this position did not take him unawares? As he farmed at Ely and St. Ives, as he fought at Marston Moor and Naseby, so he now fell into his allotted place as Milton's 'chief of men.' Such is the sum of reproach with any fairness up to this date imputed to him. 'This man will be King of England yet,' said the reverend Mr. Peters inwardly to himself, as he observed at the time in his air and manner an indescribable kind of exaltation. Sir Philip Warwick afterwards observed it too; and, being entirely at a loss to reconcile so 'great and majestic a deportment and 'comely presence' with what he remembered of his very ill-made apparel, and not very clean or sufficient linen, when he first heard him speak in the Parliament house twelve years before, is much disposed to attribute the change to the fact of his having meanwhile 'had a better tailor and more converse among good company.' The same difficulty occurs even to Clarendon, who more shrewdly dismisses it with the remark, that 'his parts seemed to be raised, as if he had concealed his faculties till he had occasion to use them.' But we shall not ourselves have any difficulty at all, if we simply believe of such a man that only the occasion for use would ever tempt him to the assumption or display. A readiness for the duty of the hour, and no restlessness beyond it, would seem to be the lesson of Cromwell's life, whatever part of it we examine; and if we think the forcible dissolution of the Long Parliament an interruption to the temperate wisdom which generally guided him, it is because we feel that without it the supreme power must needlessly have been his, unattended by the difficulties in the consequences of that act involved him. At the very least, he said himself, he was doubtful about doing it; but another and stronger impulse got the mastery over him. 'When I went there,' he told his council of officers, 'I did not think to have done this. But perceiving the spirit of God so strong upon me, I would not consult flesh and blood.' And so we arrive again at what he told Monsieur the President de Merve, that *One never mounts so high as when one does not know where one is going.*

But M. Guizot would attach little importance to that stronger

impulse which the Lord General there professed to have overruled him. We do not know that anything has impressed us more throughout his book than its extremely partial and imperfect recognition of the religious element which formed so large a portion not merely of Cromwell himself, but of the entire English Revolution. Doubtless it arises from the fact that this element, so necessary in the study of it, lies too far away from those evils which dwell insensibly and most strongly upon the historian's mind, and from which his study of these great events in our history had deliberately or unconsciously arisen. He is even careful to hint his belief, more than once, that there were in those days more infidels in England than we commonly suppose. It is curious to contrast his view in this respect with that of another French writer, M. de Lamartine, who, regarding Cromwell from the thick of French republicanism, has very partially and confusedly but as he believes wholly accepted Mr. Carlyle's interpretation, and informs his countrymen that Cromwell was a fanatic. M. Guizot, accustomed through his own life to submit to the dictates of a calm unostentatious piety all public actions, and not unfrequently reminding his reader that a Divine Providence is ordering and disposing the affairs of States, yet cannot see in Cromwell either fanatic or chosen man of God. In no part of Oliver's history do we find any swerving from this view, and subsequent and very recent reflection appears only to have confirmed him in it. In the whole of his account of 'Richard Cromwell' there is no more striking passage than that in which, describing the respective positions occupied by the followers of Oliver and the advocates of the Republic, he again expresses forcibly the distinction between the purely worldly character of the Protectorate and the Divine purpose it was called to fulfil. The Cromwellians, he says, rather by experience and political instinct than by any principle clearly comprehended or defined, did not think that the people should be held sufficient to constitute the entire Government, or that it had the right to unmake and re-construct it at its pleasure. In their opinion the Government required, for the maintenance and good order of society, some base independently subsistent, recognised by the people, but anterior, and in a certain degree superior, to its shifting will. Originally conquest, afterwards the hereditary principle in monarchy, and the preponderance of great landowners, had created in the English Government such power, independent, immovable in right, and indispensable to society. By the course of things, however, the territorial proprietorship had in part changed hands, and, by its own faults, the hereditary principle of Mo-

narchy had succumbed. But God then raised up Oliver, and gave him the power with the victory. Conqueror and actual master, surrounded by his comrades in war, and treating with a house elected by the people, he had been able to found, for his successor as for himself, the Protectorate and its Constitution; and thus was provided that anterior and independent power, born of events, not of the people's will, and which the people was as little able to destroy according to its fancy as it had been able of its motion to create. This great fact, therefore, accomplished upon the ruins of the ancient Monarchy, and in the name of necessity, by the genius of a great man sustained by God, it became the duty of all men to recognise and accept; and, from the uniform tone of his reasoning, it is manifest that the historian himself so accepts it, though he sees that it carried with it also the seeds of failure inseparable from its revolutionary origin.

He thus in a great measure excludes from consideration that particular element in Cromwell's views of Government which led him to be indifferent, in the re-constitution of the State, whether it was republican or monarchical in its political form, provided only that, above all things, it was godly in its spirit. M. Guizot thinks his mind was great, because it was just, perspicacious, and thoroughly practical; but of this greatness he does not find that religion formed any essential part, or contributed to it in any material way. He avoids, indeed, all commonplace abuse. He knows that in Cromwell's day the open use of scriptural language was no more synonymous with cant than republicanism with discord; but in both cases he appears to think that the one had a tendency to beget the other, and he accepts Cromwell's reported comment to Marten on a dialogue with one of the saints ('we must talk to these men in their own way'), as a fair hint of the value of his piety. It was no more than one portion, and not the chief, of his state craft. Even the papt and exalted fervour of his address to what we may call the assembled saints in the Barebones Parliament, M. Guizot attributes to those instincts on the part of a profound genius anxious to derive, as though immediately from God, the pretended supreme power which he had himself established, and the inherent infirmity of which he already perceived. We certainly cannot but regard as extremely remarkable the grave indifference with which the historian is thus able to set aside, as only one of many means towards a worldly end, the fervent vein of scriptural thought and feeling which runs not alone through every deliberate work of Cromwell's, but which tinges also his every lightest act, and, in his private as in his public utterances,

is that which still makes most impressive appeal to all who would investigate his character.

For this we hold to have been finally established by Mr. Carlyle, and to constitute the peculiar value of his labours in connexion with the subject. To collect and arrange in chronological succession, and with elucidatory comment, every authentic letter and speech left by Cromwell, was to subject him to a test from which falsehood could hardly escape; and the result has been to show, we think conclusively and beyond further dispute, that through all these speeches and letters one mind runs consistently. Whatever a man's former prepossessions may have been, he cannot accompany the utterer of these speeches, the writer of these letters, from their first page to the last, travelling with him from his grazing lands at St. Ives up to his Protector's throne; watching him in the tenderest intercourse with those dearest to him; observing him in affairs of state or in the ordinary business of the world, in offices of friendship or in conference with sovereigns and senates; listening to him as he comforts a persecuted preacher, or threatens a persecuting prince; and remain at last with any other conviction than that in all conditions, and on every occasion, Cromwell's tone is substantially the same, and that in the passionate fervour of his religious feeling, under its different and varying modifications, the true secret of his life must be sought, and will be found. Everywhere visible and recognisable is a deeply interpenetrated sense of spiritual dangers, and of never ceasing responsibility to the Eternal. 'Ever in his Great Taskmaster's eye.' Unless you can believe that you have an actor continually before you, you must believe that this man did unquestionably recognise in his Bible the authentic voice of God, and had an irremovable persuasion that according as, from that sacred source, he learned the divine law here and did it, or neglected to learn and do it, infinite blessedness or infinite misery awaited him for evermore.

It is also clear to us from the letters, with only such reservation as we have already intimated, and after the large allowance to be made in every case for human passion and frailty, that Cromwell was, to all practical intents, as far removed on the one hand from fanaticism, as, on the other, from hypocrisy. It is certainly not necessary that we should accept it as proof of fanaticism, that, on the day before setting out to the war with Scotland, he enlarged to Ludlow upon the great providences of God then abroad upon the earth, and in particular talked to him for almost an hour upon the hundred and tenth psalm. We have

but to remember it as the psalm in which God's promise was given to make his enemies his footstool, to make his people willing, and to strike through kings in the day of his wrath,—to understand why Cromwell so recalled it on the eve of his last entrance into battle. It is ~~as~~ little necessary that we should accept, as proof of hypocrisy, the proof M. Guizot offers of his rejecting and even ridiculing the report set about by the fanatical officers after the dissolution of the Parliamént, to the effect that he had undergone special and supernatural revelations. 'The reports spread about the Lord General,' writes M. de Bordeaux to M. de Brienne, 'are not true. He does not affect any special communication with the Holy Spirit, and he is not so weak as to be caught by flattery. I know that the Portuguese ambassador, having complimented him on this change, he made a jest of it.' But the French ambassador does not omit to accompany his statement with a careful tribute to the Lord General's zeal and great piety. Nor do we think M. Guizot justified in the belief he appears to entertain, that Cromwell's toleration of differences in religion proceeded from the merely politic spirit, and was due only to his wisdom as a ruler of men. To his profound knowledge of the art of government may indeed be referred such projects as were started in the Protectorate,—for a synod to bring the different sects into peaceful agreement, for ensuring a complete legal toleration to the Jews, and for receiving in England even a bishop of the Church of Rome to preside over the religious communion of the Catholics. But from the depth of true piety in his own soul must have proceeded that larger personal charity, which was so ready with listening ear and helping hand for any form of honest belief that claimed from him sympathy and protection. Let any one read his noble correspondence with the governor of Edinburgh Castle, when, having defeated the army of the Covenant in battle, he proceeded in argument to overthrow its preachers—and entertain any further doubt of this if he can. Those are the incomparable letters in which he reasoned out a perfect scheme of sublime toleration; in which he vindicated the execution of Charles Stuart as an act which Christians in after times would mention with honour, 'and all tyrants in the world look at with fear;' in which he warned the Presbytery that their platform was too narrow for them to expect 'the great God to come down' to such minds and thoughts; in which he told them he had not himself learned Christ as to look at ministers as lords over, instead of helpers of, God's people; and in which he desired them especially to point out to him the warrant they had in Scripture for believing that to preach was *their* function exclu-

sively. 'Your pretended fear lest error should step in, is like the man who would keep all the wine out of the country lest men should be drunk. It will be found an unjust and unwise jealousy to deprive a man of his natural liberty upon a supposition he may abuse it. When he doth abuse it, judge.' And then, within some six months or so, Edinburgh having meanwhile surrendered, and the Presbytery, recovered from its sulks, having accepted permission again to open its pulpits, you see this same Cromwell respectfully himself attending their services and sermons, and taking no other notice of the latter being specially directed against himself and his fellow 'sectaries,' than to desire friendly discourse with the ministers who had so railed against them, to the end that, if possible, misunderstandings might be taken away.

Neither had Cromwell, before he evinced this spirit, waited until authority fell to him as Lord General, at which time, in M. Guizot's view, considerations altogether politic and worldly began largely to operate with him. There is a very remarkable letter decisive as to this, which the 'Gentleman's Magazine' first published three quarters of a century ago, but which Mr. Carlyle has been able to confirm by proof and adjust to the right place in his life,—the year after the battle of Naseby. Not long before the date of it he had entered Ely cathedral while the Reverend Mr. Hitch was 'performing' the choir service, and with a '*leave off your fooling, and come down, sir,*' had turned the reverend gentleman sheer out of the place, intoning, singing, and all. But this was because Mr. Hitch had become a nuisance to a godly neighbourhood, and had treated with deliberate disregard a previous warning of Oliver's to the very plain and legible effect, that, 'lest the soldiers should in any tumultuous or disorderly way attempt the reformation of the cathedral church, I require you to forbear altogether your choir service, so unedifying and offensive; and this as you shall answer it, if any disorder should arise thereupon.' And notwithstanding the prompt procedure by which he kept his word in this case, he shows himself, in the letter we have named and are now about to quote, not less ready to protect any honest people differing completely from himself in regard to choir or other services, provided always they so exercised their unedifying faith as not to be offensive to others. He intercedes with a Royalist gentleman, in the same (Norfolk) county, for liberty of conscience to certain of his tenants. 'And,' he writes, 'however the world interprets it, I am not ashamed to solicit for such as are anywhere under pressure of this kind; doing even as I would be done by. Sir, this is a quarrelsome age, and

'the anger seems to me to be the worse, where the ground is difference of opinion; which to cure, to hurt men in their names, persons, or estates, will not be found an apt remedy.'

The religion which so teaches us our duty to others is not very likely to fail us in regard to ourselves. Watch Cromwell in any great crisis of his life, and judge whether the faith he held could have rested on any doubtful or insecure foundation. Take him at the moment of his greatest triumph, or in the hour of his darkest peril, and observe whether the one so unduly elates or the other so unworthily depresses him, as to cause him to lose the sense either of his own weakness or of his Creator's power,—either of the littleness of time or of the greatness of eternity. In the very majesty of his reception after the Worcester battle, 'he would seldom mention anything of himself,' says Whitelocke, describing their meeting at Aylesbury; 'mentioned others only; and gave, as was due, the glory of the action unto God.' In his last extremity at Dunbar, when Leslie, with an army of double his numbers, flushed with victory, had so hemmed him in with his sick, starving, and dispirited troops, as they retreated and were falling back upon their ships, that, to use his own expression, 'almost a miracle' was needed to save them, there is, in the tone of the letter he sent to Haselrig on the Newcastle border, such a quiet and composed disregard of himself, such a care only for the safety of the cause, such a calm and sustained reliance upon God, as we doubt if the annals of heroism can elsewhere parallel. 'Whatever becomes of us,' he wrote, 'it will be well for you to get what forces you can together; and the south to help what they can. If your forces had been in readiness to have fallen upon the back of Copperspath, it might have occasioned supplies to have come to us. But the only wise God knows what is best. All shall work for good. Our spirits are comfortable, praised be the Lord; though our present condition be as it is. Let Henry Vane know what I write. I would not make it public, lest danger should accrue thereby.'

Whatever else might desert this man, hope and faith never did. There was one who stood afterwards by his death-bed, while a worse storm shook the heavens than even that which had swept along the heights of Dunbar, and who recalled these days in testimony of the strong man he had been. 'In the dark perils of war, in the high places of the field, hope shone in him like a pillar of fire, when it had gone out in all the others.' Nor in the high places only, but in the solitude or privacy of his chamber, he impressed in like manner all who had intercourse with him. It was ever they who stood nearest

him who had reason to admire him most; and to the eyes even of valets and chamber-grooms, the heroic shone out of Cromwell. It is from one who held such office in his household we have a picture of him handed down to us which Vandyke or Velasquez might have painted. A body well compact and strong; his stature under six foot ('I believe about two inches'); his head so shaped as you might see it both a storehouse and shop, of a vast treasury of natural parts; his temper exceeding fiery ('as I have known'), but the flame of it kept down for the most part, or soon allayed with those moral endowments he had; naturally compassionate towards objects in distress, even to an effeminate measure, though God had made him a heart, wherein was left little room for any fear; '*a larger soul, I think, hath seldom dwelt in a house of clay than his was.*' What Englishman may not be proud of that written portrait of Oliver Cromwell, still fresh from the hand of worthy Mr. John Maidstone, cofferer and gentleman-in-waiting on the Lord Protector of England?

Of the general estimate of him formed by the French historian little more need be said. There is much we might further make objection to; but compressed and brief as our summary of M. Guizot's views has been, it will perhaps be understood with sufficient reservation. He does not reject the stories of the Irish massacres, though they are unwittingly refuted even by Cromwell's most eager enemies, the Irish priests, in the Clonmacnoise manifesto. He retains, on authority that has been fairly questioned, a great many reports which otherwise confirm ill thoughts of the Protector. But to the full worldly extent of the term, his Cromwell, whether before or after the Protectorate, was one of the great men of the earth. He is under the influence of ambition, but it is an ambition generally qualified, and often exalted, by the state necessities to which it bends. The question which so early arose between him and the Long Parliament, M. Guizot calls the beginning of a duel, which he holds that neither party engaged in could avoid forcing on to its close. Of one or other of them, he believes it became the duty *cedere majori*; and from the tone of his reasoning we are left to infer also his belief, that in the latter days of the struggle it could not but occur to the Parliament, while claiming over Cromwell a nominal supremacy, to feel the sting of the last portion of the epigram, *Ille gravis palma est, quam minor hostis habet*. One very interesting point we think certainly very clearly established by his researches to illustrate the details he gives of the 'duel.' He shows more decisively than any previous historian that Cromwell, before the Republic fell by his

hand, was indisputably the first man in it; not simply in right of his victories, but by the administrative genius he had displayed, and by the light in which the foreign courts already regarded him. At the same time, as it seems to us, he fails himself to attach sufficient importance to this; and perhaps generally somewhat underrates the influence and connexion of foreign policy with the domestic administration of England at the period.

But the mistake, if it be one, does not stint the details M. Guizot gives, which open to us the manuscript treasures of the Hague, and the unpublished archives of the French foreign office, as well as those of Simancas in Spain, and pour upon this part of his great subject a flood of steady and original light. His volumes thus include details of various confidential missions, and much other matter of the highest interest, of which the most essential portions are given complete in a copious appendix. That we should always admit their evidence in exactly the light in which M. Guizot seems disposed to accept it, we of course do not find to be necessary. Although M. Cr  ll   on the part of France, and Don Alonzo de Card  nas on the part of Spain, both express and act upon opinions of Cromwell's character which agree generally with the judgment formed of it in M. Guizot's book, it may yet with perfect fairness be said that neither a gentleman from the court of Philip II., nor a gentleman from the court of Louis Quatorze, bound to the policy of a statesman of the stamp of Mazarin, were very likely to understand an exalted zeal like Cromwell's, assuming it to have been always what it claimed to be. Putting aside such feats of policy, however, as an alleged deliberate sowing of discord for state purposes between the absent king and his brothers, and some few other acts justified only by the too freely permitted distinction between private and political morality, especially in foreign relations, there is nothing in these new discoveries of which any defender of Cromwell has need to be ashamed, and there is a vast deal to confirm very strikingly the sense of his greatness.

We give a few examples. Before the time of the Protectorate, by the chief statesmen of both parties in the war of the Fronde then raging in France, the upward course of the great leader of the popular party in England had been watched with anxiety and dread. Both feared and hated him; yet such was their position in regard to Spain and each other, that his friendly countenance to either was become of inexpressible value. He had hardly arrived in London after the battle of Worcester, when, in answer to overtures from De Retz at the

instant of the brief triumph which preceded his fall, he sent Henry Vane with a letter to him (a striking proof that up to this time, that 'great parliamentarian and intimate confidant of 'his,' as the Cardinal describes him, could have had no suspicion of any blow meditated against the parliament); and this also is the date when Mazarin, affecting to put a friendly construction upon rumours that had reached him of a proposed expedition of Cromwell's into France, eagerly suggests to M. Croullé through M. Servien that if at the close of his Scottish campaign Mr. Cromwell should come into France, being as he is a person of 'merit, he will be well received here, for assuredly every one 'will go to meet him at the place where he disembarks.' Of course M. Croullé promptly disabuses his master of that notion of a friendly trip; but, in also contradicting the report that any hostile intentions were entertained to France, he is careful to reproduce for the Cardinal the haughty terms in which Cromwell himself was said to have denied it. 'Looking at his hair, which 'is already white, he said that if he were ten years younger 'there was not a king in Europe whom he could not make to 'tremble, and that, as he had a better motive than the late king 'of Sweden, he believed himself still capable of doing more 'for the good of nations than the other ever did for his own 'ambition.'

Nevertheless it was while overtures were on all sides secretly going on, and still during De Retz's brief predominance, that the double-faced Mazarin thus wrote from his place of exile at Bruhl to discredit De Retz with the queen. It was probably written at the very moment when the coadjutor himself was attempting to justify his intercourse with Vane on the express ground of what he calls Mazarin's 'base and continual 'flattery' of Cromwell. 'The coadjutor has always spoken with 'veneration of Cromwell, as of a man sent by God into 'England, saying that he would raise such men also in other 'kingdoms; and once in good company, where there was Ménage 'present, hearing the courage of M. de Beaufort extolled, he 'said in express terms, *if M. de Beaufort is Fairfax, I am 'Cromwell.*' We subjoin a portion of M. Guizot's comment, which we need hardly say we have translated for ourselves.

'Mazarin excelled in poisoning, for the ruin of his enemies, their actions or their words, and at the same time in taking to himself impudently their examples and their weapons. While he thus showed to the queen's eyes, as a crime in the coadjutor, his opinion of Cromwell, he laboured himself to enter with Cromwell, into close relations. Too shrewd not to recognise that in that direction, in

England, lay the capacity and power*, it was to the future master of the republic, no longer to the republican parliament, that he made his advances. Cromwell lent himself to them willingly; he too was incessantly bent on making to himself powerful friends everywhere. "He adroitly leaves to others the conduct and care of whatever begets outcry," said, in 1650, Croullé to M. Servien, "and reserves to himself affairs that confer obligation; concerning which at least he sets rumour afloat, in such manner that if they succeed they may be attributed to him, and if not that one may see he willed them well, and that the result came of hindrance from others."†

We cannot quote all the details of the overtures that thus began, curious and impressive as they are, but through none of them, the reader soon perceives, was Mazarin a match for Cromwell. The great soldier and statesman, though with his own predilections hampered by the prejudices of the country, and standing between the intrigues of the rival Courts of France and Spain, yet knew how to play his game with perfect safety, and to obtain substantially all that he desired. Up to the time of the expulsion of the Long Parliament, no alliance had yet been concluded with either Court; though at the moment of its expulsion, Bordeaux was under the impression that a treaty with it, on the part of France, was on the point of being happily concluded. But Mazarin had been already obliged, even without deriving any immediate advantage from the step, formally to recognise the Republic and its leaders; and with hot haste, as soon as the Long Parliament was dissolved, the Cardinal of course eagerly betook himself to the power that remained triumphant. 'Mazarin,' writes M. Guizot, always prodigal of 'flattering advances, wrote to Cromwell to offer him, and ask from him, a serviceable friendship. Cromwell replied to him 'with a rare excess of affected humility.' And then follows a little note, concerning which Mr. Carlyle, believing it to exist

* *'Trop sagace pour ne pas reconnaître que là étaient, en Angleterre, l'habileté et le pouvoir.'* According to the translator, 'Too sagacious not to perceive that in him were centred all the power and ability then existing in England.'

† A letter to Mazarin from the Count d'Estrador is added, in which, though the date is the 5th of February, 1652, the title of Protector is given to Cromwell. Of course therefore M. Guizot is careful to remark, in a note, that as the letter and its date are beyond question, the title of Protector must have been intercalated some years afterwards; but his translator does not think it worth while either to translate this note, or explain the confusion it was intended to remedy; and in subsequently giving the note of June '53, quoted in the text, he appends to its signature the title (P.) which its very context should have shown him did not then belong to the writer.

only in the form of a French translation made by Mazarin, remarked, that 'it would not be wholly without significance if 'we had it in the original.' Here it is in the original.

' Westminster, 9th of June, 1653.

' It is surprise to me that your Eminency should take notice of a person so inconsiderable as myself, living (as it were) separate from the world. This honour has done (as it ought) a very deep impression upon me, and does oblige me to serve your Eminency upon all occasions, so as I shall be happy to find out. So I trust that very honourable person, Monsieur Burdop [Bordeaux] will therein be helpful to

' Your Eminencie's

' Thrice humble Servant,

' O. CROMWELL.'

The historian calls this a rare excess of affected humility; but after all what is there more, in the counterfeit humility, than such a reply to a compliment as every gentleman in England makes every week in some form to somebody. 'You do me too much honour. There is nothing that I would not do to serve you, Sir. Good morning.'

There is never in truth any affected humility, but rather a contempt very thinly covered, if not openly avowed, on the part of Cromwell to Mazarin; nor does this find anywhere more characteristic expression than in the evidence M. Guizot incidentally gives us of the sort of gifts they interchanged. While Mazarin sent over regal presents of tapestry, wine, and Barbary horses, Cromwell, familiarly and half contemptuously confident that he had to do with a man more avaricious than vain, would return such compliments by forwarding so many cases of pure Cornwall tin. As to their public intercourse throughout, the historian sees that it was but a constant interchange of concessions and resistances, services and refusals, in which they ran little risk of quarrelling, for the simple reason that they mutually understood each other, and did not require from one another anything which could not be denied without doing greater injury than the grant would do service; but it was after all a kind of equality in which the personal predominance undoubtedly remained with Cromwell. It is he whom it is manifestly impossible, throughout, either to intimidate or deceive; and though it was no small art on Mazarin's side, as soon as he saw this, to affect to meet his adversary with the same simple frankness, there can hardly be a question which plays the greater figure, he who possessed the art, or he who always reduced its possessor to the necessity of practising it.

Of Cromwell's first effort after the dissolution of the Long

Parliament to govern with the help of the men who had been parties to that act of violence, the result, according to M. Guizot's view, was to show him that reforming sectaries and innovators, though useful instruments of destruction, are destructive to the very power they establish; and that the classes among whom conservative interests prevail are the only natural and permanent allies of authority. Yet he had no choice but to renew his efforts in the same direction, with what help this experience could give; for the French historian has satisfied himself that his honest desire was so far, by any possible means, to place himself in subordination to English law, as to obtain co-operation from a fairly-chosen Parliament that should consent honestly to assist him in establishing a Cromwell dynasty of kings, and in restoring, with the monarchy, the ancient form of Lords and Commons. But still his attempts were unavailing. He could not restore that which he had so helped to destroy. Amid the ruins which his hands had made, he was doomed to see the vanity of those rash hopes, and to learn that no government is, or can be, the work of man's will alone. In the endeavour to obtain such a Parliament as the old usages of England sanctioned, he raised up more than one semi-constitutional assembly; but merely to destroy it when it disappointed him, and with it, as he well knew, his only safe means of taxing the people he would govern. The money needful for State purposes thus failing him, he was at last driven to the expedient pronounced by M. Guizot to be the political act which caused his ruin—the establishment of Major-Generals to levy tithes on the revenues of the royalists. By this iniquitous act, M. Guizot declares that he detached his glory from the cause of order and peace, in the name of which he had begun to found his throne, and plunged his power down among the depths of revolutionary violence. ‘He invoked,’ says the constitutional historian, ‘necessity; and without doubt thought himself reduced to that; if he was right, it was one of those necessities inflicted by God’s justice, which reveal the innate vice of a Government, and become the sentence of its condemnation.’

From this time to the end, M. Guizot is of opinion that Cromwell was thoroughly conscious of the weakness with which he was smitten by his own act, and that it was upon feeling in all directions for support he perceived his surest prop to be the advocacy of liberty of conscience. Of the formal discussion which he afterwards raised with his friendly Parliament on the question of his assuming royal state, the historian speaks as of a comedy performed for the instruction of the nation. It was designed to make men familiar with the topic, and to scatter abroad a variety

of arguments in its favour; but the interference of the army brought the comedy to an unwelcome end. Cromwell resigned the name of king; and with it, the historian appears to think, the power of much longer retaining kingly authority. He had arrived at the slippery height on which to stand still was impossible, and there was no alternative but to mount higher or to fall. His heart failed him; he now saw, that, die when he might, he must be content to leave behind him for his successors the two enemies he had most ardently combated, anarchy and the Stuarts; and M. Guizot's comments leave it to be inferred as his opinion, that had he long survived the discomfiture which embittered his last months, even his political position might have been seriously endangered. He died, however, in the fullness of his power, though *sorrowful*. 'Sorrowful not only because he must die, but also, and above all, because he must die without having attained his true and final purpose.'

But that his, nevertheless, was the strong resolve which exclusively upheld the State as long as life remained to him, M. Guizot shows nowhere so emphatically as in the description of the Protectorate of his son. The weak purpose of Richard being substituted for his father's iron will, every party again became loud in the assertion of his own particular theory, 'accomplices became rivals,' and soon in the stormy sea of faction the good ship of the Republic drifted an utter wreck. Then were seen, according to the historian, the faults both of the pure republicans and the adherents of Cromwell revenging themselves upon their authors. For what more easy than the way at last appeared to be, to a firm establishment of Richard Cromwell's government? Whatever his infirmities of character, he was disliked by none. M. Guizot quotes golden opinions expressed of him by all sorts of people, and points out that the whole private interest of the members of his first Parliament lay in the assurance of his power, and with that also of their own prosperity. He describes the Government as having no design and no desire of tyranny; Richard himself as naturally moderate, patient, equitable; and his counsellors, like himself, as demanding nothing better than to govern in concert with the Parliament, and according to the laws. What, then, so natural or so reasonable, as for all men who had not vowed their hearts to the old royal line or to the pure republic, to accommodate themselves to the *régime* established, and to live, by common consent, tranquil and safe under the new Protector? But it was not to be. Though their empire had vanished, their obstinacy remained unenlightened and unsubdued. Detested as oppressors, and decried as visionaries, they retorted by accusing

their country of ingratitude, and battled vainly against the successive defeats which they knew not that the hand of God was inflicting. Though they could not build they could destroy, and so the second Protectorate passed away.

Yet let us not leave the reader under any doubt whether a full or a stinted measure of justice is done by the historian to what was really successful as well as great in the policy of the first Protectorate. It is on every account our interest to give M. Guizot further hearing as to this, since it enables us to give further indication of the very valuable original illustrations contributed by his book to our English annals.

M. Guizot describes the foreign policy of Cromwell as based on two fixed ideas,—peace with the United Provinces and the alliance of the Protestant States. These were in his eyes the two vital conditions of the security and greatness of his country in Europe, of his own security and his own greatness in Europe and in his country. With the United Provinces peace was at once made, Whitelocke was sent upon his embassy to Sweden, a special treaty of commerce was negotiated with the King of Denmark, and Cromwell found himself on terms of friendship with all Protestant States of Europe. It was said in France, continues M. Guizot, that he even meditated, in the interests of Protestantism, a more vast and difficult design.

“The Protector proposes to himself,” wrote to the Cardinal Mazarin one of his confidential agents, “to cause the assembly of a council of all the Protestant communions, to re-unite them in one body for the common confession of one and the same faith.” Some particular facts indicate that he was, indeed, preoccupied with this idea. He was one of those persons of powerful and fertile genius in whom great designs and great temptations are born by crowds; but he applied promptly his firm good sense to his finest dreams, and never pursued farther those which did not endure that trial.

‘He assumed towards the Catholic powers an attitude of complete and frigid independence, without prejudice or ill-will, but without forwardness, showing himself disposed to peace, but always leaving to be seen a glimpse of war, and carrying a rough pride into the care of the interests of his country or of his own greatness.’*

* We cannot resist giving M. Guizot's text in this latter paragraph in connexion with the version of his translator. ‘Il prit envers les puissances Catholiques une attitude de complète et froide liberté,—sans préjugé ni mauvais vouloir, mais sans empiètement, se montrant disposé à la paix, mais laissant toujours à voir la guerre, et portant une fierté rude dans le soin des intérêts de son pays ou de sa propre grandeur.’ That is an admirable specimen of M. Guizot's style and manner in this book. We could hardly instance a better. But now observe the following: ‘To-

We need not pause to relate how he showed this: for one example, by treating with the King of Portugal, who was stigmatised at Madrid as an usurper, and by the simultaneous execution, for murder, of Don Pantaleon de Sã, the brother of the ambassador from Portugal. M. Guizot's very interesting narrative is full of similar and striking proof, the greater part of it quite new. France and Spain outdo each other in obsequious homage before Cromwell's intractable energy. We see each bidding higher and higher against the other for his active friendship, and Cardeñas at last eagerly offering him a subvention of no less than six hundred thousand dollars a year, 'without having in London or in Flanders,' wrote Mazarin to Bordeaux, 'the first sou to give him if he took them at their word. He would promise with the same facility a million, indeed two, to get a pledge from him, since assuredly it would not cost them more to hold and execute one promise than the other.' Mazarin, a better diplomatist, enriches *his* promises with a flowing courtesy; sends with them his wine, his tapestry, and his Barbary horses; and concedes, on the part of the young king, a rank only less than royal. Even the Prince of Condé hastens to become acceptable to the rough English soldier, and declares his belief that the people of the three kingdoms must be now at the summit of their happiness at seeing their goods and lives confided to so great a man.

'Cromwell received all these advances with the same show of good will: not that he saw them all with equal eye, or that he drifted indifferent or uncertain among allies so opposite. Unlike the Long Parliament, he inclined much more towards France than towards Spain: with a superior sagacity he had perceived that Spain was thenceforward an apathetic power, able to effect but little, and in spite of its favourable demonstrations, more hostile than any other to Protestant England, for it was more exclusively than any other given up to the maxims and influences of the Roman Church. And at the same time that there was little to expect from Spain, she offered to the maritime ambition of England, by her vast possessions in the new world, rich and easy prey.'

Accordingly there soon followed, we need hardly remind the reader, the well known swoop upon the King of Spain's West

'wards the Catholic powers he assumed an attitude of complete and fearless liberty, unmarked by prejudice or ill-will, but equally void of courtship or flattery, shewing himself disposed to maintain peace, but always leaving open the prospect of war, and watching over the interests of his country and of his own family with stern and uncompromising haughtiness.'

Indian possessions. 'The better half of the design failed, indeed, when the attack upon St. Domingo failed; but the seizure of Jamaica was an unquestionable prize, which Cromwell's wisdom turned at once to a noble account. The historian describes all these incidents and their consequences in a way that shows ever characteristically the personal predominance of the Protector. Up to within a few days of the declaration of war against Spain, hope has continued with Cardenas. To even the hour of the treaty of alliance with France, fear has not quitted Mazarin. And by a free use of the very words of the men who wrote freshly and on the instant out of the midst of their diplomacy, the foreign policy of the Protectorate is thus with vivid truth and a rare freshness reproduced by M. Guizot. We may compare the mighty tread of Cromwell with the pirouettes of the statesmen opposed to him, and get no mean perception of the hero of the day.

Of the conditions of the treaty at last concluded with France, it is not necessary that we should speak; but the jealous rigour with which Cromwell insisted on the concession to himself of the title of *Brother*, and on the substitution of *Rex Gallorum* for *Rex Gallie*, is a pregnant indication of the attitude now assumed by him to the most powerful of foreign States. Never, certainly, had our English name been carried so high. 'He is the greatest and happiest prince in Europe,' exclaimed young Louis Quatorze. Bound in fast treaties with all the Protestant States, allied to the most potent of Catholic Sovereigns, Montecuculi deprecating his wrath on one side as agent for the house of Austria, and on the other the Marquis of Leyden on behalf of the King of Spain, he received, besides the foreign ministers who habitually resided at his court, ambassadors extraordinary from Sweden, Poland, Germany, and Italy, who came solemnly to present to him the overtures or homage of their masters. Pictures and medals, some nobly commemorative of his exploits, others coarsely satirical of his adversaries, were displayed in almost every town of the Continent, celebrating his deeds, and humbling the old princes and kings before them. Well might one of the most considerable of the foreign agents write over to Thurloe from Brussels that 'the Lord Protector's government makes England more formidable and considerable to all nations than it has ever been in my day.'

Nor is less justice rendered by M. Guizot to what he believes to have been another of the titles of that government to esteem; and of Cromwell's patronage of literature and learned men, he speaks with due respect. Though he holds that his mind was neither naturally elegant nor richly cultivated, he can yet see

that his free and liberal genius understood thoroughly the wants of the human intellect. And while M. Guizot's experience has taught him, clearly enough, that absolute power, on emerging from great social disturbances, takes its chief delight and achieves its completest triumphs in the promotion of material prosperity, still, in regard to Cromwell, he frankly admits that few despots have so carefully confined themselves within the limits of practical necessity, and allowed the human mind such a wide range of freedom. He sees in him the practical saviour of the two old Universities, and the founder of the University of Durham. He is glad to record that he offered Hobbes the post of a secretary in his household, that he continued the employment of Milton, and that he took no offence at either Selden or Casaubon, when the one declined his pension, and the other his invitation to write a history of the civil wars. He dwells with pleasure on his kindness to the learned Usher, on his desire to stand well with Cudworth and Taylor, on his frank patronage of all the lettered Puritans, and on the facts that Waller had a place in his court, that Butler was permitted to meditate *Hudibras* in the house of one of his officers, and that Davenant obtained his permission to open a private theatre for performance of his comedies. He might have added that the Lord Protector had himself a taste for innocent and cheerful recreation; that he had no objection to play at Crambo, or even occasionally smoke a pipe with my Lord Commissioner Whitelocke, who also has left us a pleasant anecdote contrasting his laughter and gaiety to the soldiers with the greater impatience and reserve of Ireton; and that, in the correspondence of one of the Dutch ambassadors, there is a picture of his courteous habits on state occasions, and of the dignified and graceful conduct of his household, which far exceeds in sober grandeur and worth any other court circular of that age. 'The music played all the while we were at dinner,' says Herr Jongestall, 'and after, the Lord Protector had us 'into another room, where the Lady Protectress and others 'came to us, and we had also music and voices.'

To these graces of his private life, and to his domestic love and tenderness, which even his worst enemies have admitted, M. Guizot is of course not slow to pay tribute; but on one point he has suffered himself to be strangely misled. He gravely mentions Cromwell's infidelity to his wife, as if it were an admitted fact, and not a mere royalist slander; and he seems to think that some complaints of her own remain in proof of a well-founded jealousy. Jealousy there may be, in the solitary letter of this excellent woman which has descended to us; but it is the jealousy only of a gentle and sensitive nature, shrinking from the least ruffle or

breath of doubt that can come between itself and the beloved. 'My dearest,' she writes, 'I wonder you should blame me for writing no oftener, when I have sent three for one: I cannot but think they are miscarried. Truly, if I know my own heart, I should as soon neglect myself as to omit the least thought towards you, when in doing it I must do it to myself. But when I do write, my dear, I seldom have any satisfactory answer, which makes me think my writing is slighted; as well it may; but I cannot but think your love covers my weakness and infirmities. Truly my life is but half a life in your absence.' That is not the writing of a woman jealous of any thing but the share of her husband's time and care which public affairs steal from her. Most touching, too, is a letter of his own of nearly the same date, written to her from the very midst of the toils and perils of Dunbar, in which he tells her that truly, if he does not love her *too* well, he thinks he errs not on the other hand much, and assures her that she is dearer to him than any creature. Let M. Guizot be well assured that he has here fallen into error.

Of another error into which he has fallen, also connected with the domesticities of Cromwell, we have now, in conclusion, to speak in somewhat more detail. It touches an interesting point in Cromwell's history, and we are happy to be able to remove all further doubt respecting it. By none who have yet written on the subject has it been stated correctly.

Five sons were born to Cromwell, of whom the youngest, James, born in 1632, certainly died in his infancy, and the eldest, Robert, born in 1621, is supposed in all the biographies not to have survived his childhood. The second son, Oliver, born in 1623, grew to manhood, and his name is to be found enrolled as a cornet in the eighth troop of what was called 'Earl Bedford's Horse.' He was killed in battle, but in our opinion certainly not so early as appears to be fixed by Mr. Carlyle, who accepts an allusion in a letter of his father's written after Marston Moor as referring to this loss, which we are about to show might have had quite another reference. Be this as it may, however, all the biographers up to this time have agreed in regard to the eldest, Robert, that what is comprised in Mr. Carlyle's curt notice, '*Named for his grandfather. No further account of him. Died before ripe years,*'—must be taken to express whatever now can be known. Cromwell's only distinct reference to any of his sons while yet in tender years, is contained in a letter addressed to his cousin, Oliver St. John's wife, while she was staying with his friend and relative Sir William Masham, at ~~Essex~~ in Essex; and Mr. Carlyle connects the reference in this

letter with the fact that some two or three of Cromwell's sons were certainly educated at the neighbouring public school of Felsted, where their maternal grandfather had his country-seat. But the allusion surely relates specifically to one son, who appears to have been either staying with the Mashams at the time, or the object of some particular care and sympathy on their part. 'Salute all my friends in that family whereof you are yet a member. I am much bound unto them for their love. I bless the lord for them! and that my son, by their procurement, is so well. Let him have your prayers, your counsel.'

Such was the amount of existing information respecting the two eldest sons of Cromwell, when Mr. Forster, in his 'Statesmen of the Commonwealth,' reproduced from one of the king's pamphlets a very striking account of the death-bed of the Lord Protector, written by a groom of the chamber in waiting on him. In this Cromwell was represented calling for his Bible, and desiring those verses from the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians to be read to him, in which the Apostle speaks of having learned in whatever state he was therewith to be content, for he could do all things through Christ which strengthened him. 'Which read,' (the account proceeded) 'said he, to use his own words as near as I can remember them, *This scripture did once save my life; when my eldest son died; which went as a dagger to my heart: indeed it did.*' Naturally enough, this affecting passage was supposed by Mr. Forster to relate to his son's death in battle, and Mr. Carlyle arrived also at the same conclusion so confidently, that after 'eldest son' he put in 'poor Oliver' in reprinting it, at the same time carefully marking the words as an insertion. M. Guizot, however, has gone two steps further, and printed the passage thus: 'Ce texte, dit-il, m'a sauvé une fois la vie, quand mon fils aîné, *mon pauvre Olivier, fut tué*, ce qui me perça le cœur comme un poignard.' In making this change without the least authority, M. Guizot marked unconsciously the weak point in the supposition he had adopted from others, and on which he was himself too confidently proceeding. If the Protector had really intended his allusion for the son who had been slain in battle, would he not, in place of the simple expression 'when my eldest son died,' more probably have said just exactly what M. Guizot has thought it necessary to say for him?

We are now in a position to prove that the allusion was not to Oliver, but to Robert; that Robert lived till his nineteenth year; that he was buried at Felsted within seven months of the date of the letter containing the allusion to the kindness of

the Mashams respecting him; and that his youth had inspired such promise of a future as might well justify the place in his father's heart kept sacred to his memory as long as life remained. In the register of burials at the parish church of Felsted, under the year 1639, is the following entry: 'Robertus Cromwell filius honorandi viri M^{us} Oliveris Cromwell et Elizabethæ uxoris ejus sepultus fuit 31^o die Maii. Et Robertus fuit eximie pius juvenis deum timens supra multos.'* Which remarkable addition to a simple mention of burial we need hardly point out as of the rarest occurrence on that most formal of all the pages of history—a leaf of a parish register; where to be born and to die is all that can ever be conceded to either rich or poor. The friend who examined the original for us could find no other instance in the volume of a deviation from the strict rule. Among all the fathers, sons, and brothers crowded into its records of birth and death, the only *vir honorandus* is the puritan squire of Huntingdon. The name of the vicar of Felsted in 1639 was Wharton; this entry is in his handwriting, and has his signature appended to it; and let it henceforward be remembered as his distinction, that long before Cromwell's name was famous beyond his native county, he had appeared to this incumbent of a small Essex parish as a man to be honoured.

The tribute to the youth who passed so early away, uncouthly expressed as it is, takes a deep and mournful significance from the words which lingered last on the dying lips of his heroic father. If Heaven had but spared all that gentle and noble promise which represented once the eldest son and successor of Cromwell's name, the sceptre then falling might have found a hand to grasp and sustain it, and the history of England taken quite another course. The sad and sorry substitute—is it not written in M. Guizot's narrative of the Protectorate of Richard Cromwell?

* This curious entry has been more than once carefully examined, and it is here printed *verbatim et literatim*, as it stands in the register. The word denoted by the contraction M^{us} is 'Militis,' in the sense of esquire, or arm-bearing gentleman, and there are some rare examples of its use with this meaning before a proper name. 'Ritter and Miles,' says Selden (*Titles of Honour*, lvi.), often signify in the old feudal law of the Empire, a gentleman, as the word gentleman is signified in *nobilis*, and not a dubbed knight; as with us in England the word *milites* denotes gentlemen, or great freeholders of the country also.

- ART. II.—1. *Himalayan Journals; or Notes of a Naturalist in Bengal, the Sikkim and Nepal Himalayas, the Khasia Mountains, &c.* By JOSEPH DALTON HOOKER, M.D., R.N., F.R.S. With Maps and Illustrations. A new Edition. 8vo. 2 vols. London: 1855.
2. *Western Himalaya and Thibet; a Narrative of a Journey through the Mountains of Northern India during the Years 1847-8.* By THOMAS THOMSON, M.D., F.L.S., Assistant-Surgeon Bengal Army. 8vo. London: 1852.

DR. HOOKER has been a fortunate as well as an enterprising traveller. The son of that eminent botanist and estimable man, Sir William Hooker, he early imbibed a sincere and ardent love of science, which is in itself no mean inheritance, and a minute acquaintance with botany in particular. A taste for adventure and for exploring new countries, which the volumes before us sufficiently display, probably led him to enter the Navy as an assistant surgeon in 1839. We next find him in 1845, still at an early age, a candidate for a northern professorship, but as he was (fortunately perhaps for himself) unsuccessful on this occasion, he applied for and obtained a naturalist's appointment with Sir James Ross's antarctic expedition. Although that remarkable voyage was necessarily sparing in results of natural history, being chiefly directed across the widest seas of the globe, or towards ice-bound coasts of the most terrific and inaccessible character, it promoted the views of Dr. Hooker, inured him to hardship and enterprise, and made him known to the chiefs of the Admiralty and other members of the Government. The scientific results of this expedition received the honourable notice of Baron Alexander von Humboldt, whose generous sympathy ever attends the young and ardent student and traveller of whatever country and with whatever pursuits. To his recommendation and Sir William Hooker's influence as Director of the Botanical Gardens at Kew, Dr. Hooker was mainly indebted (as we learn from the preface to his work) for the important countenance and assistance of Lord Carlisle, then Chief Commissioner of Woods and Forests, and of Lord Auckland, then First Lord of the Admiralty.

On the recommendation of these influential persons, what was originally intended as a private botanical expedition to India was converted into a journey of which the expense was almost entirely defrayed by the Treasury, whilst every political and material difficulty was lightened or removed by the effectual

co-operation, of the Home and Indian Governments. In this respect we have called Dr. Hooker a fortunate as well as deserving traveller. 'The East India Company has indeed frequently shown an enlightened liberality in promoting the researches of its own officers throughout its wide dependencies; but the British Government has been notoriously penurious in giving such encouragement. If an accurate knowledge of the physical geography, statistics, natural and civil history of different countries, and particularly of those with which we may have political and commercial relations (and what countries does not this include?) be of national importance,—then it cannot possibly be obtained so cheaply or so effectually as by defraying the bare expenses of young, accomplished, and enterprising men, who are willing, from the love of science and without ulterior views of profit, to spend the flower of their days and the strength of their constitutions in acquiring that information which mere money or mere official services can never obtain. The little which the Home Government has yet done to promote science in this way has been by organising great and expensive expeditions, in which the scientific branch comes in for a nominal share of the cost under the economical plea that a surgeon being necessary, if a man of zeal and information be appointed to the post, he may *do the science gratis*. If instead of this cumbrous, indirect, and really expensive mode of proceeding, a few more expeditions like Dr. Hooker's had been patronised by the State; if active men, singly or by pairs, had been commissioned to acquire effectually, and for the public, information which they are burning to be able to acquire for themselves, an almost imperceptible annual grant from the Treasury would have done more for the advancement of our knowledge of the globe and its inhabitants than all the costly expeditions which our Government has sent forth from the time of Cook to the last disastrous voyage of Franklin. We have been the last nation of Europe (except perhaps Spain and Italy) to act on this plan. France and Holland, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, even Denmark and Norway, have not deemed it a waste of public money to send forth individual explorers to different countries of Europe, as well as to more distant lands, to collect for the national behoof the best fruits of their special capacities and attainments. This subject is one which Dr. Hooker's journals very naturally bring before our notice; and we may add that it is greatly to be wished that amongst the improvements contemplated in the Universities the handsome endowments of travelling fellowships may be made con-

ductive to the same ends, instead of being degraded into unprofitable sinecures.

Dr. Hooker's first patrons, Lord Carlisle and Lord Auckland, procured him 400*l.* a year for the three years of his Indian journey, and the same annuity was continued for three years longer on his return home to enable him to arrange and describe his collections. This last grant was not obtained without pressing instances; the influence of the presidents of three principal scientific societies and of numerous private friends had to be brought to bear upon the purse-holders of the nation. Nor was Dr. Hooker less fortunate abroad. The civilities of the Governor-general, Lord Dalhousie, commenced before he left Britain, and by a propitious coincidence the naturalist embarked in the same vessel with his Excellency for India, and appears to have successfully cultivated his friendship, since we find that he was desired to consider himself as one of the Governor-general's suite, thus ensuring his good reception in every part of the British Dominions, and his admission into countries otherwise inaccessible to Europeans. We find also in the second volume of the work before us that Lord Dalhousie's prompt recognition of his scientific friend procured his release from a tedious, and it might have been a dangerous, captivity.

The choice of the locality of his researches (principally botanical) was left to himself. His selection of the province of Sikkim and part of Nepaul seems to have been judiciously made. The district was not too large; it includes some of the highest summits of the Himalaya range and, consequently, of the globe; and owing to political and other circumstances, it has scarcely been visited by any traveller.

Let us cast a passing glance on the topography of Northern India, including that astonishing range more peculiarly termed Himalaya. Its geographical extension, from the great southerly bend of the river Indus on the west to the southerly bend of the Burrampooter on the east, is nearly 1400 miles. It includes the highest mountains in the globe, and is also connected with by far the largest mass of elevated ground in the known world. It passes through the following territories from west to east; 1. Kashmir, 2. the Punjaub, 3. Simla, 4. Kumaon, 5. Nepaul, 6. Sikkim, 7. Bhotan. All these are on the southern slopes. The northern parts are occupied by Thibet, of which the province of Ladak, opposite to the Punjaub, is the only one accessible to Europeans. The north-western provinces, being now wholly or in great part under British control, have been most frequently visited, although they

are still very imperfectly known. The independent kingdom of Nepaul has been hitherto guarded from intrusion with a jealousy almost Chinese. Sikkim and Bhotan are also little known. Dr. Hooker, therefore, in taking advantage of the political circumstances which allowed him to visit part of Nepaul and Sikkim, cut out for himself a work equally interesting and new; and if the only result of his journeys had been the construction of the clear and useful maps which accompany the first (but not the second) edition of these volumes, geographers would still have had cause to be indebted to him.

The great chain of the Himalaya mountains, following a curvilinear ground plan, of which the convexity is directed towards the plains of India, forms only one of a series of *somewhat* parallel chains, which together constitute the great High Land of Asia and of the world. Of the interior arrangements of these vast mountains, aptly called by a late writer 'that wonderful nucleus of the earth's anatomy,' comparatively little is known.* This was the problem which the distinguished Humboldt proposed to solve when he first devoted himself to the study of Physical Geography, but from which he was withheld—it may be feared—by an unworthy political jealousy. The slow progress of events is gradually filling up the gap which this unfortunate mistake left exposed for half a century.

Without the slightest wish to depreciate what has been done by British travellers in India, we may safely affirm that the mantle of Humboldt has not in general descended on them. Endowed

* According to the views adopted by the authors of the works whose titles are placed at the head of this article, and which, we believe, represent pretty correctly the present general opinion, the true centre of the Himalayan range is north of the vastly elevated lake of Manasarawar, 200 miles east of Simla, which was visited first by Moorcroft and more lately by Captains Richard and Henry Strachey. From this point, the chain visible from the plains of India extends east and west. Diverging from the same centre in a north-westerly direction, is the chain of Kouenlun or Karakoram, dividing the valley of the Indus from that of Yarkand, and in an easterly direction, a chain runs into Thibet, of which nothing is known except that it is to the north of the Thibetan branch of the great Burrampooter. The Karakoram again in its north-western continuation probably unites itself to a second great knot in Central Asia, which sends off a branch towards the Caucasus, and another running north-east, which divides the waters flowing into the Arctic Sea from those that traverse the Chinese Empire. What a vast wilderness of mountains, here roughly indicated, remains all but unknown!

with characteristic patience and scorn of difficulties, Moorcroft and Trebeck, Gerard and Lloyd, besides several meritorious officers of the Indian service, explored the north-western part of the Himalaya; but they appear to have been deficient in many of the qualities of the philosophic traveller, in habits of generalisation, and, not least of all, in the art of communicating to the world, in a perspicuous and interesting style, a knowledge of what they saw. Dr. Hooker has advanced a step beyond his predecessors in attention to the interests of the general reader, as well as in the variety and extent of his scientific acquirements, and in his outfit for observing facts and collecting specimens. His volumes are also copiously illustrated. Still we must regret that he has adhered so strictly to the text of his journal. Although his title prepares us for the publication of notes made on the spot, with subsequent enlargement and correction, we think that he might, by a more thorough recast of his materials, have succeeded in producing a more interesting book. The new edition has been condensed and omits the scientific appendices.

Dr. Hooker's first volume opens with an excursion as far as Benares, and a journey to Dorjiling in Sikkim, the starting point of the succeeding explorations. Dorjiling, a British sanatory station, 7000 feet above the sea, is placed on one of the outer spurs of the Himalaya mountains, and is little removed from the vast plain of Bengal, which extends for some hundred miles with little variation of level, as far as the mouths of the Ganges. But though the elevation of Dorjiling be moderate and its distance from the plain thus trifling, the climate is so very different from what we are inclined to call tropical (its latitude is only 27°), that we must notice the fact and its causes more particularly.

'It is curious,' says Dr. Hooker, 'that throughout this temperate region, there is hardly one eatable fruit, except the native walnut, and some brambles, of which the "yellow" and "ground" raspberry, are the best, some insipid figs, and a very austere crab apple. The European apple will scarcely ripen, and the pear not at all. Currants and gooseberries show no disposition to thrive, and strawberries are the only fruits that ripen at all, which they do in the greatest abundance. Vines, figs, pomegranates, plums, apricots, &c. will not succeed even as trees. . . . A singular and almost total absence of the light and of the direct rays of the sun, in the ripening season, is the cause of this dearth of fruit.' (Vol. i. pp. 159, 160.)

No wonder that so un-Indian a climate is sought by invalids whose constitutions have been toasted on the broiling gridiron of Bengal. Here the temperature hardly ever

'rises above 70° in the summer months,'—there is a boundless contiguity of shade, dense forests covering the hills without break or opening; rain falls every month of the year, and to the extent of 120 inches per annum; during the heats of summer, and also in the warmest part of every day, a canopy of cloud obstructs the direct rays of the sun and produces the singular effect on horticulture which has just been described.* This singular phenomenon is in a great measure local, and depends, according to Dr. Hooker, on a peculiar concurrence of circumstances. The principal are these:—the prevalent wind in Sikkim is a south-east wind, blowing directly from the Bay of Bengal, which is but little modified by the (comparatively) moderate space of flat ground much covered with vegetation which it traverses before striking against the roots of the Himalaya. These gigantic mountains rise steadily northwards from the point in question, speedily attaining the limit of perpetual snow (15 to 16,000 feet), and finally reaching the loftiest known elevations in the world.† No wonder, then, that there is rapid condensation and continual mixing of hot and cold currents of air;—that the more the air is charged with moisture due to the high temperature of the season, or of the hour of the day, the more certain and complete is the formation of cloud and the obscuration of the sun. At Dorjiling the hottest hour of the day is about noon, whereas at Calcutta it is at 2½ P.M. 'The mean temperature

* It is not surprising that the claims of Dorjiling to a good climate have been contested, as appears to be the case from a paragraph in Dr. Hooker's second volume. He was informed that the two seasons he spent there were unusually damp and rainy; on which he shrewdly remarks, 'I have never visited any spot under the sun, where I was not told that the season was exceptional, and generally for the worse.' His own opinion, notwithstanding, is in favour of the Dorjiling sanatorium: 'The climate,' he says, 'is above the average in point of comfort, and for perfect salubrity rivals any; while in variety, interest, and grandeur, the scenery is unequalled.' (Vol. ii. p. 249.)

† The wind in question is (Hooker, ii. 389. note) the Monsoon properly so called from May till October, and prevails also during the rest of the year, 'as a current from the moist atmosphere above the Gangetic Delta.' Its course towards the Himalaya 'does not appear to be materially disturbed by the north-west wind, which blows during the afternoons of the winter months over the plains, which is a dry surface current due to the diurnal heating of the soil.' Something similar to what is here described, and the effects on the climate referred to in the text, occurs in the Pyrenees when the wind blows from the Bay of Biscay.

'is very nearly 50° , or 2° higher than that of London, and 26° below that of Calcutta.' The difference between the hottest and coldest months is only 22° , whilst in London it is 27° . The climate is therefore subject to very moderate variations of temperature.

All the 'peculiarities of this sub-alpine climate disappear whether we approach the mountains or recede from them. In the latter case the frigorific influence of the great cold masses soon becomes imperceptible; in the former the prevalent wind or monsoon breaking against ridges of continually increasing height, soon has its temperature lowered to the dew point, when, instead of damp, it becomes excessively dry and pursues its course over the successive ridges and elevated valleys or table-lands of Thibet in the very same condition. Those inhospitable regions are therefore basking in sunshine at the very time when the middle or sub-alpine belt of country is covered with cloud or deluged with rain.

Hence, 'any view of the Himalaya, especially at a sufficient distance for the remote snowy peaks to be seen overtopping the outer ridges, is rare, from the constant deposition of vapours over the forest-clad ranges during the greater part of the year, and the haziness of the dry atmosphere of the plains in the winter months.' Occasionally, however, especially when the monsoon has ceased to blow, the mountain summits may be seen from the plains at a distance of even 200 miles; but the effect is described as less imposing than one might fancy, owing to the lowness of the angle under which they are then viewed, and the duskiess of the horizon. The inferior hills, which shut out the view of the great chain as we approach it, are described as monotonous and uninteresting, the vegetation with which they are covered is sombre, and unbroken by rock precipices or cultivation. When, however, these heights are scaled at a propitious season, as in the month of November, when the rains have ceased, and early in the day, the panorama is exceedingly grand. Such an one is described by Dr. Hooker (vol. i. p. 184.), as seen from a summit of 10,000 feet high, not far from Dorjiling, which may probably be compared in effect to the view of Mont Blanc from Mount Salève near Geneva. Kinchinjunga, the giant of the chain, rises still 18,000 feet above the spectator, and is flanked by 'a dazzling mass of snowy peaks, intersected by blue glaciers, which gleamed in the slanting rays of the rising sun like aquamarines set in frosted silver.' This vast mountain is nearly due north of the station of Dorjiling, and it appears to divide Nepaul on the west

from Sikkim, and both those districts from Thibet on the north. In the north-east is seen the scarcely less imposing mass of Donkia, which, though less elevated than the last, is much more massive; at a considerable distance beyond it and to the right, is Chumulari, a mountain in Thibet, 24,000 feet high. A great part of this panorama may be seen from Dorjiling itself, and the frontispiece to Dr. Hooker's work, gives a good idea of the grandeur of this Indo-alpine scenery. It will be some consolation, however, to those lovers of nature who have little chance of viewing the Himalaya to learn our author's very frank admission that the Swiss mountains, 'though barely possessing half the sublimity, extent, or height, are yet far more beautiful.' (Vol. i. p. 123.)

The country which he proceeds to explore and describe, lies chiefly about the roots of these great mountains, and a clear general idea of it will be formed if we state that his first excursion is up the valley (running north and south) of the river Tambur in Nepaul as far as the passes of the Himalaya immediately to the west of Kinchinjunga; his second excursion is in the proper territory of Sikkim, which includes the parallel valley of the river Teesta and its tributaries lying altogether east of Kinchinjunga and terminating in the glaciers of Donkia. Neither of these valleys are of vast extent compared to many in the Himalaya; indeed, the whole area of Dr. Hooker's especial explorations, as represented in his second map, does not much, if at all, exceed that of the cantons of Berne and the Vallais united, in Switzerland. We mention this because it explains a good many things which seemed less clear when we first read the book with the idea in our minds of a more extensive country.

Dorjiling is the residence of Dr. Campbell, superintendent of the sanatory establishment and likewise agent of the Governor-general with the Rajah of Sikkim. In him Dr. Hooker found a zealous friend. He obviated, in the first instance, the obstacles to entering the Sikkim territory; he supplied our traveller with men and provisions, and accompanied him (as it turned out at some personal risk), in several of his journeys. At Dorjiling too, our author found with Mr. Hodgson an agreeable home in the intervals of his journeys, which amounted to some months at a time, and also material assistance in collecting information and reducing his observations.

The natives of the country in which Dorjiling is situated and of Sikkim generally, are termed Lepchas. They are supposed to be of Mongolian origin and have adopted the

religion of Boodha (so far as they have any), and many of their manners and customs from the Thibetans, with whom a very constant commercial intercourse is maintained across the numerous snowy passes of the Himalaya. The Lepchas are a peculiarly peaceable race. They have a mild, frank, and engaging expression, and are naturally indolent. In this respect they contrast strongly with their Nepaulese neighbours on the west, and the Bhotanese on the east.

‘Such,’ says our author, ‘are some of the prominent features of this people who inhabit the sub-Himalayas, at elevations of 3000 to 6000 feet. In their relations with us, they are conspicuous for their honesty, their power as carriers and mountaineers, and their skill as woodsmen, for they build a waterproof house with a thatch of banana leaves in the lower, or of bamboo in the elevated regions, and equip it with a table and bedsteads, for three persons, in an hour, using no implement but their heavy knife. Kindness and good humour soon attach them to your person and service. A gloomy-tempered or merose master they avoid, an unkind one they flee. If they serve a good hillsman like themselves, they will follow him with alacrity, sleep on the cold bleak mountain exposed to the pitiless rain without a murmur, lay down the heavy burden to carry their master over a stream, or give him a helping hand up a rock or precipice,—do anything in short, but encounter a foe, for I believe the Lepcha to be a veritable coward.’ (Vol. i. p. 136.)

Dr. Hooker’s volumes contain many illustrations of the serviceable attentions of these faithful followers. Thus a Lepcha having dropt accidentally a thermometer intrusted to him, returned at his own request a day’s journey or more, amidst solitary wilds 16,000 feet above the sea, where he spent a cold October night without fire or shelter, taking refuge in the water of a hot spring, and fortunately returned possessed of his prize. ‘It required a stout heart and an honest one,’ says his master, ‘to spend a night in so awful a solitude as that which reigns around the foot of the Kinchinjhow glacier.’ An almost feminine attention to the wants and comforts of those whom they guide is not less striking; thus before starting on cold mornings, the handles of their sticks were well warmed and presented to the travellers by the Lepchas and Thibetans.

The party were often put to very uncomfortable straits on the bleak ridges of the borders of Thibet, and the suffering from cold to which the inhabitants of the warm damp valleys of Sikkim are exceedingly liable (often producing severe illness), was aggravated by the want of provisions. Yet these good people never complained or threatened to desert. Dr. Hooker writes:—

‘After boiling my thermometer (for the altitude), on these occasions I generally made a little tea for the party, a refreshment to which they looked forward with childlike eagerness. The fairness with which these good-hearted people used to divide the scanty allowance, and afterwards the leaves, which are greatly relished,’ [we observe that Professor Johnston maintains this to be the rational and scientific way of consuming tea,] ‘was an engaging trait of their simple character.’ I have still vividly before me their sleek swarthy face and twinkling Tartar eyes, as they lay stretched on the ground in the sun, or crouched in the sleet and snow beneath some sheltering rock; each with his little polished wooden cup of tea, watching my notes and instruments with curious wonder, asking, “How high are we?” “How cold is it?” and comparing the results with those of other stations with much interest and intelligence.’ (Vol. ii. p. 52.)

Dr. Hooker’s first grand expedition was into Eastern Nepal, and consisted principally in following to its source on the Thibetan frontiers the river Yangma, and in exploring the environs of the giant of the range, Kinchinjunga. The party numbered fifty-six persons. This, in Europe at least, would be considered travelling *en prince*. It included a Nepaulese guard and numerous porters carrying stores, books, instruments, bed, paper for plants, collectors and preparers of plants and animals, — in short quite a scientific caravan. But so much help often defeats its purpose, at least in remote districts. Provisions for this multitude had to be carried for great distances, some became lazy and obdurate, and finally Dr. Hooker was glad to reduce the number of his attendants within more restricted limits.

The following extract gives an idea of the scenery of the upper part of the Tambur river: —

‘The path lay northwest up the valley, which became thickly wooded with silver fir and juniper: we gradually ascended, crossing many streams from lateral gulleys, and huge masses of boulders. Evergreen rhododendrons soon replaced the firs, growing in inconceivable profusion, especially on the slopes facing the south-east, and with no other shrubs or tree vegetation, but scattered bushes of rose, spiræa, dwarf juniper, stunted birch, willow honeysuckle, barberry and a mountain ash. . . . At 12,000 feet the valley was wild, open, and broad, with sloping mountains, clothed for a thousand feet with dark green rhododendron bushes; the river ran rapidly and was broken into falls here and there. Huge angular and detached masses of rock were scattered about, and to the right and left snowy peaks traversed over the surrounding mountains, whilst among the latter, narrow gulleys led up to blue patches of glacial ice with trickling streams, and shoots of stones. . . . The prevalence of lichens common to this country and to Scotland, which

coloured the rocks, added an additional feature to the resemblance to Scotch Highland scenery. Along the narrow path, I found two of the commonest of all British weeds, a grass, and the shepherds purse! They had evidently been imported by man and Yaks*, and as they do not occur in India, I could not but regard these little wanderers from the North with the deepest interest. . . . At this moment, these common weeds more vividly recall to me that wild scene than does all my journal, and remind me how I went on my way, . . . musing on the probability of the plant having found its way thither over all Central Asia, and the ages that may have been occupied on its march. On reaching 13,000 feet, the ground was every where hard and frozen, and I experienced the first symptoms of lassitude, headache, and giddiness, which, however, were but slight, and only came on with severe exertion.' (Vol. i. pp. 220, 221.)

Dr. Hooker next proceeds to describe the final stages of the ascent of the Wallanchoon pass between Nepaul and Thibet: —

'The following morning (Nov. 26th), I started with a small body to visit the pass, continuing up the broad grassy valley: much snow lay on the ground at 13,500 feet, which had fallen the previous month; and several glaciers were seen in lateral ravines at about the same elevation. . . . The morning was splendid; the atmosphere over the dry rocks and earth at 14,000 feet vibrating from the power of the sun's rays, whilst vast masses of blue glacier and fields of snow choked every gulley and were spread over all shady places. . . . At 15,000 feet the snow closed in on the path from all sides. The guide declared it to be perpetual henceforward, though now deepened by the heavy October fall; the path was cut some three feet through it. Enormous boulders of gneiss cumbered the bottom of the gorge, which gradually widened as we approached its summit, and rugged masses of black and red gneiss and mica-schist, pierced the snow, and stood out in dismal relief. . . .

'Towards the summit of the pass the snow lay very deep, and followed the course of a small stream which cut through it, the walls of snow being breast high on each side; the path was still frequented by Yaks, of which we overtook a small party going to Thibet, laden with planks. All the party appeared alike overcome by lassitude, shortness and difficulty of breathing, a sense of weight on the stomach, giddiness and headache with tightness across the temples. . . . The last few miles had been most laborious, and the three of us who gained the summit were utterly knocked up. Fortunately, I carried my own barometer; it indicated 16,206 inches, giving by comparative observations with Calcutta, 16,764 feet and with Dorjiling, 16,748 feet, as the height of the pass.' (Vol. i. pp. 223-5.)

* *Yak*, a sort of cow used in Thibet as a beast of burden.

We may take this opportunity of making some remarks on the glaciers of the Himalaya, with which the valley of Yangma abounds in its higher parts, whilst the lower portion is covered by *moraines*, and other proofs of their formerly greater extension. The earlier explorers of the Indian Alps, we believe without exception, speak exclusively of 'snow beds' in which the different rivers take their origin. Down to a very late period it was doubtful whether true glaciers, like those of Switzerland, existed in these latitudes. The oversight is probably to be ascribed to the fact that a majority of British travellers in India had had little opportunity of seeing other countries or of studying physical geography; whilst their studies and pursuits had led them in a different direction from the writings of De Saussure, at that time the only considerable author who treated of glaciers in detail.* More lately a renewed attention to the subject in Europe, the publication of several works connected with it, and a general appreciation of the geological importance of these moving masses of ice, have occasioned their recognition, in the course of a few years, almost from one end to the other of the vast Himalaya chain.

We believe that Mr. Vigne, in his interesting work on Cashmir, was one of the first, if not the very first, to describe the well-defined and extensive glaciers of the Western Himalaya. Subsequently Major Madden described briefly a group of glaciers, the sources of the river Pindur, somewhat farther east, in the journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; he was succeeded by Captain Richard Strachey, who being well acquainted with the researches of Professor James Forbes in Switzerland, found no difficulty in furnishing evidence of the exact identity of the glacial phenomena of Upper India, and he measured by similar methods the diurnal progress of the ice. Some years later Dr. Thomas Thomson, the friend and afterwards the companion of Dr. Hooker, made extensive observations on the geographical distribution of the glaciers of Thibet, to which we shall again refer in the course of this article; and finally Dr. Hooker himself, visiting the far eastern parts of the Himalaya, found all the phenomena of glaciers most fully developed, many of which he has described in the work before us, and which receive the most complete illustration from the many

* It has, singularly enough, long been the custom to look upon the Himalaya as a tropical range of mountains in which it was as a matter of course regarded as impossible that glaciers could exist. (Thomson's *Western Himalaya*, p. 475.) The absence of glaciers in the parts of the intertropical Andes visited by Humboldt probably contributed to this oversight.

striking lithographic views in colours which are included in his volumes.

Dr. Hooker had, it appears, less advantage in a previous acquaintance with the subject than the two authors last named. He was not then aware of the observations on the Swiss Glaciers; and it appears from a remark in the first volume of the work before us (p. 232.) that it was in the Yangma valley that he first saw true mountain glaciers, though he was already familiar with the very different and perhaps not less majestic forms which ice assumes on the shores of the Antarctic continent. But though it is not to be supposed that he should have observed as extensively and critically as if his attention had been especially called to the subject, his good habits of accurate observation enabled him to note correctly facts which had escaped many acute travellers, and to give evidence of the substantial identity of the phenomena of glaciers in Europe and in the East.

‘I made frequent excursions to the great glacier of Kinchinjhow, a mountain in Sikkim 22,750 feet in height. Its valley is about four miles long, broad and flat. Changgo-khang rears its blue and white cliffs 4500 feet above its west flank, and throws down avalanches of stones and snow into the valley. Hot springs burst from the ground near some granitic rocks on its floor, about 16,000 feet above the sea. . . . The terminal moraine is about 500 feet high, quite barren, and thrown obliquely across the valley from north-east to south-west, completely hiding the glacier. From its top, successive smaller parallel ridges (indicating the periodic retirements of the glacier) lead down to the ice, which must have sunk several hundred feet. . . The surface, less than half a mile wide, is exceedingly undulated and covered with large pools of water ninety feet deep, and beds of snow, and is deeply corroded; gigantic blocks are perched on pinacles of ice on its surface, and the gravel cones are often twenty feet high. The crevassing, so conspicuous on the Swiss glaciers, is not so regular on this, and the surface appears more like the troubled ocean, due no doubt to the copious rain and snow which falls throughout the summer, and the corroding power of wet fogs. The substance of the ice is ribboned, dirt-bands are seen from above to form long loops on some parts, and the lateral moraines, like the terminal, are high above the surface. The notes, made previous to reading Professor Forbes’ *Travels in the Alps*, sufficiently show that perpetual snow, whether as ice or glacier, obeys the same laws in India as in Europe; and I have no remarks to offer on the structure of glaciers that are not well illustrated or explained in the above-mentioned admirable work.’ (Vol. ii. p. 133.)

One of the largest glaciers of the Himalaya appears to be that which descends (it is stated) from the eastern part of

Kinchinjunga, in one unbroken mass 14,000 feet high, to the head of the Thlonok river in Sikkim (vol. ii. p. 50.)*; yet this glacier terminates at an elevation of about 14,000 feet above the sea†, whilst in the Western Himalaya they descend to 11,000 feet. The cause of this does not seem evident, unless it be that the warm rains of Sikkim thaw the glaciers in the valleys, and also the effect of latitude, which is about 4° less. It would seem more consonant to experience to expect that the murky and damp climate of the Eastern Himalaya would promote snowy accumulations, which in fact depend mainly on the lowness of temperature of the *hottest* months of the year: and we suspect that it will be found that the difference arises almost exclusively from the larger feeding basins or rivers whence the material of the glacier is derived in the Western Himalaya,—a circumstance infinitely more material than the height of the mountains whence it descends. Indeed this is almost demonstrated by the fact that the level of perpetual snow does not materially differ in the two situations.

Scarcely second in importance to the observation of existing glaciers, is the proof of their former greater extension and of their agency in transporting rocks and modifying the features of valleys. In no country does this appear more strikingly evident than in Upper India. Captain Strachey, Dr. Thomson, and Dr. Hooker all insist on numerous proofs of what may now be considered a well-established fact.‡ The evidence, however, as we gather, extends only to the extension of glaciers down the valleys, not to their having invaded the plains of India or even (except rarely) the sub-alpine ranges. This brings us back to the Yangma valley in Nepal, where there occur numerous ridges of transported blocks, which have had the effect, so familiar in Switzerland, of damming up the stream and causing a series of lakes until they have ultimately

* Yet, if Dr. Hooker's map be correct, it is not immediately from Kinchinjunga, but from a lower range, that the Thlonok valley takes its origin.

† About lat. 28° in Sikkim, the inferior level of glaciers is 16,000 feet, the snow line being proportionably higher. (Vol. ii. p. 396.)

‡ On the Donkia Mountain, in lat. 28°, on the borders of Sikkim and Thibet, which Dr. Hooker ascended to a height of 19,300 feet, he conceives the snow line to be not below 19,000, and at forty miles further north he supposes it further raised to 20,000 feet (vol. ii. p. 128.). He seems to think that in Europe, the Alps for example, the height of the snow line has been understated, but we are not altogether convinced by his arguments. (Vol. i. p. 252. and vol. ii. p. 394.)

been drained by the erosion of the river dividing the barriers. This is clearly described in the closing paragraphs of the tenth chapter of Dr. Hooker's work, and is illustrated by a map of the district drawn by Mr. Petermann. 'The proofs,' says Dr. Hooker, 'of glaciers having once descended to from 8000 to 10,000 feet in every Sikkim and East Nepal valley communicating with mountains above 16,000 feet elevation are overwhelming, and the glaciers must in some cases have been fully 40 miles long and 500 feet in depth.'*

Intimately connected with the subject of glaciers is that of the level of perpetual snow. On this matter Dr. Hooker gives us some curious and valuable information, much of which, however, is contained in one of the Appendices, where, notwithstanding its interesting nature, it will probably be sought by few readers. After the general fact of the existence of perpetual snow, at a certain height under the tropics, was established, and the height at which it occurs in India estimated at from 15 to 16,000 feet †; — after it was well known also that the level of the snow line, as it was called, is gradually depressed in the temperate zone of either hemisphere, — it came to light by degrees, and was first clearly stated by Von Humboldt, that on the mountains of Thibet, in a higher latitude than the India Himalaya, perpetual snow throughout the year must be sought at a much greater elevation than on the sunny slopes which face the Indian Peninsula. So startling a fact caused incredulity. There is, however, no doubt, that in the main Von Humboldt was correct, and that the principal cause was that which he assigned, — the excessive dryness of the climate of Thibet, and the small depth of snow which, notwithstanding the rigour of the climate, ever falls there. Captain Richard Strachey, in an interesting paper published a few years ago on the subject, stated the matter very clearly, and published his own observations upon it. ‡ With these opinions, the views taken by Dr. Hooker, and also by Dr. Thomson, in his travels in Western Himalaya, in the main coincide, and they are as follows: — The level of perpetual snow, or the limit of the extreme recession of snow-covered ground at any season of the year is, speaking generally, lowest on the range of the Himalaya facing the plains of

* See Appendix E. in Hooker's Journals, p. 395.

† Or lower, near the plains of India; but this was an error from want of due attention to the season of greatest recess of the snows, and also to the confusion of mistaking glaciers for snow beds.

‡ In the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, new series, No. xxviii., and in Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal for 1849.

Bengal, where it may be stated at 15,500 feet, from which it gradually (at first rather suddenly) rises, as we advance northwards into the heart of the mountains, where it attains a level varying from 18,500 to perhaps even 20,000 feet, the increasing height continuing (though slowly) with the furthest northern point which travellers have attained. Let it be observed, therefore, that the case is not as if the Himalaya were a single range, and that the snow lies lower on the declivity facing the interior of Thibet, than on the southern slopes towards India. It is on the contrary, for the most part true, that on the same mountain or range, snow lies lower on the northern than on the south exposure; but this is obviously consistent with a gradual rise of the snow line as we move northwards. The effect of northing even sometimes exceeds the contrary effect of a north aspect, as is shown in Dr. Hooker's interesting section of the Himalaya in the longitude of Sikkim, (vol. ii. p. 391.) and more definitely by the statement made by Dr. Thomson (W. Himalaya, p. 480.), that whilst on the south side of the Umasi pass, across the first high chain between the plains of India and the river Indus, glaciers descend to 11,500 feet, on the northern side one much more massive terminates at 14,000 feet; and this is confirmed by other observers. The cause no doubt is, that the hot winds deposit so much of this moisture on the first snowy face they meet with, that after passing the crest of the chain they have already become comparatively dry. As but a small portion of the interior ranges rise above 20,000 feet, the aspect of Thibet has that perfectly bare and arid character which we have elsewhere described, and the snowy mountains, *par excellence*, are those which belong to the Indian frontier. Thus Kinchinjunga, the giant of the whole, though belonging to a spur or offset of the southern range, is covered with perpetual snow for nearly 13,000 feet.*

We have already briefly referred to the peculiarity of climate which causes these apparent anomalies. The summer of the middle Himalaya is gloomy and overcast, that farther ~~and~~ is bright and cheerful. So striking is this fact, that Dr. Hooker records (vol. ii. p. 60.), that the temperature of the rivers, instead of increasing steadily as they descend the Himalaya valleys, actually diminishes, *the snow line being depressed in a southerly direction more rapidly than the course of the stream*. Again, if the nature of the climate be sought from the progress to maturity of plants, the Rhododendron tribe pass

* Hooker, vol. ii. p. 128. The same remarks apply to the Western Himalaya

through the stages of flower and fruit in one-fourth of the time, under the bright skies of the Inner Himalaya, which they require in the mild valleys of the lower ranges: 'The short, backward spring and summer of the Arctic zone is overtaken by an early and forward seed-time and winter. So far as regards the effect of mean temperature, the warmer station is in autumn more backward than the colder.' (Vol. ii. p. 181.) Thus we see concentrated in India, within a very small space, the effects of continental and maritime climates, which elsewhere require immense tracts of country for their development.

Before quitting the Nepalese journey, we must find room for two short quotations. The first is a specimen of Dr. Hooker's descriptive powers, which, as we have hinted, might have been with advantage more frequently brought forward. The subject is a view from the Choonjerma pass, belonging to the Kinchinjunga chain, and not far from a noble pyramid 24,000 feet high, named Junnoo, which is by much the steepest and most conical of all the peaks of this region; yet, notwithstanding its vast dimensions, our author candidly states, that it is 'not nearly so remarkable in outline,' and 'far less picturesque,' than Mont Cervin (Matterhorn), in the vicinity of Monte Rosa; another testimony to the unsurpassed scenery of our European Alps. But here is the quotation:—

'As the sun declined, the snow at our feet reflected the most exquisitely delicate peach-bloom hue, and looking west from the top of the pass, the scenery was gorgeous beyond description, for the sun was just plunging into a sea of mist, amongst some cirrhi and stratus, all in a blaze of the ruddiest copper hue. As it sank, the Nepal peaks to the right assumed more definite darker and gigantic forms, and floods of light shot across the misty ocean, bathing the landscape around me in the most wonderful and indescribable changing tints. As the luminary was vanishing, the whole horizon glowed like copper run from a smelting furnace, and when it had quite disappeared, the little inequalities of the rugged edges of the mist were lighted up, and shone like a row of volcanoes in the far distance. I have never before or since seen anything which for sublimity, beauty, and marvellous effects could compare with what I gazed on that evening from Choonjerma Pass. In some of Turner's pictures I have recognised similar effects caught and fixed by a marvellous effort of genius. Dissolving views give some idea of the magic creation and dispersion of the effects, but any combination of science and art can no more recall the scene, than it can the feelings of awe that crept over me, during the hour I spent in solitude amongst these stupendous mountains.' (Vol. i. p. 266.)

In the latter part of this journey, the author visited the environs of Kinchinjunga, the highest mountain of the known

world. Its absolute elevation, 28,178 feet*, has been ascertained trigonometrically on the excellent authority of Colonel Waugh, formerly assistant to Colonel Everest in the measurement of the Indian arc of the meridian, and now, we believe, chief surveyor to the East India Company. The authority, therefore, for this astonishing elevation is unquestionable. It rises in three heads of nearly equal height, the second highest being 27,826 feet. Dr. Hooker very justly observes, that 'mere elevation is in physical geography of secondary importance.' If the Himalaya were depressed 18,000 feet in the ocean, Kinchinjunga would be a rocky islet 10,000 feet high, but secondary in importance to the more extensive elevations of Donkia to the eastward. Neither of these masses belongs properly to the axis of the chain, but rather to an offset to the south of it; for the rivers of Thibet, which rise to the northward of both, find their way into the regular drainage of the Ganges much further west. It is to be regretted that Dr. Hooker's advances towards this new and unvisited 'monarch of mountains' were during winter, when the snows were deep and the weather cold. His nearest approach was the summit of a hill called Mon Lepcha, eighteen miles distant (vol. i. p. 345.). The angular elevation of Kinchinjunga was from thence only $9\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$. It exposes many precipices too steep for the snow to adhere, and the colours and form suggested to Dr. Hooker a granitic formation. From the views of this noble mountain which Dr. Hooker has been at pains to take in numerous directions, we form a good general idea of its figure, which is on the whole pointed (especially as seen from Dorjiling), and possesses a stately symmetry. It will unquestionably be an interesting feat for some future traveller to explore its base more completely, though it may be feared that its ascent, on account of the rarity of the air and the extent of snow to be traversed, will be for ever impracticable.

We now come to the second portion of Dr. Hooker's journey, undertaken in the summer of 1849, into Sikkin Proper, which we have anticipated a good deal in speaking of snowy mountains and glaciers generally. As we have as yet said little of the inconveniences and personal annoyances of these expeditions, (though our author dwells slightly upon them, and seems to have yielded to them as little as any traveller possibly could,) we shall introduce the reader to some of the insect torments of the woody region of the Himalaya.

* So generally stated by Dr. Hooker, but at vol. i. p. 345., at a foot less.

‘Leeches swarmed in incredible profusion in the streams and damp grass, and among the bushes; they got into my hair, hung on my eyelids, and crawled up my legs and down my back. I repeatedly took upwards of a hundred from my legs, where the small ones used to collect in clusters on the instep; the sores which they produced were not healed for five months afterwards, and I retain the scars to the present day.*. . . Another pest is a small midge or sand fly, which causes intolerable itching and subsequent irritation, and is in this respect the most insufferable torment in Sikkim; the minutest rent in one’s clothes is detected by the acute senses of this insatiable bloodsucker, which is itself so small as to be barely visible without a microscope. We daily arrived at our camping ground, streaming with blood, and mottled with the bites of peepsas, gnats, midges, and mosquitos, besides being infested with ticks’ (vol. ii. p. 18.). ‘A large tick infests the small bamboo, and a more hateful insect I never encountered. A traveller cannot avoid these insects coming on his person (sometimes in great numbers) as he brushes through the forest: they get inside his dress and insert the proboscis deeply without pain. Buried head and shoulders and retained by a barbed lancet, the tick is only to be extracted by force, which is very painful. I have devised many tortures, mechanical and chemical, to induce these disgusting intruders to withdraw the proboscis, but in vain.’ (Vol. i. p. 166.)

Our author’s route now lay up the valley of the Teesta river in Sikkim, which he thoroughly explored to its sources, at the foot of the mountains of Bhomtso and Donkia. The greatest difficulty he had to experience was the opposition of the petty tribes on the frontiers of Thibet to his farther progress in that direction. The Rajah of Sikkim, though immeasurably indebted to the English for the peaceable enjoyment of his territories, which are ever threatened by the warlike Ghorkas and Nepaulese on the one hand, and by the Bhotanese on the other, seems to have been little disposed to tolerate the investigation of his country by an Englishman; and besides he was quite under the control of his ‘Dewan,’ or vizier, an unfriendly and indeed rascally fellow from whom Dr. Hooker, and even Dr. Campbell, the East India Company’s Agent, suffered a grievous imprisonment. The petty authorities, the ‘Phipuns’ and ‘Soubahs,’ like understrappers in all countries, were not more accommodating, and used alternately wiles and threats to induce our traveller not to explore the frontiers. This is, indeed, nothing more than an instinct which seems deeply implanted in all tribes of Thibetan origin or connexion. An Englishman is their especial dread—an Englishman who makes

* Leeches disappear at the level of 11,500 feet (vol. ii. p. 54.).

maps is little less formidable than an invading army. Here is a specimen of Dr. Hooker's discussions with the authorities:—

'The Singtam Soubah visited me daily, and we enjoyed long friendly conversations. . . . His question always was, "How long do you intend to remain here? Have you not got all the plants and stones you want? You can see the sun much better with those brasses and glasses lower down; it is very cold here, and there is no food." . . . Finally, the Soubah tried to persuade my people, that one so incorrigibly obstinate must be mad, and that they had better leave me. . . . Nothing puzzled him so much, as my being always occupied with such, to him, unintelligible pursuits; a Thibetan "cui bono" was always in his mouth: "What good will it do you? Why should you spend weeks in the coldest, hungriest, windiest, loftiest place on the earth, without even inhabitants?"' (Vol. ii. pp. 69-71.)

In truth, this description is not exaggerated, and were not Thibet interesting from its extreme inaccessibility and singular physical geography, it would be one of the most undesirable spots on the globe to live in, or even to visit. We find it described in Dr. Hooker's first volume (still on the authority of one of the unfriendly governors) as a 'mountainous, and inconceivably poor country. There are no plains save flats in the bottom of the valleys, and the paths lead over lofty mountains. Sometimes when the inhabitants are obliged from famine to change their habitations in winter, the old and feeble are frozen to death standing and resting their chins on their staves; remaining as pillows of ice, to fall only when the thaw of the ensuing spring commences.' (Vol. i. p. 299.) This we know, from the unexceptionable testimony of MM. Huc and Gabet, to be almost literally true.

Dr. Hooker ascended several of the passes which lead into Thibet, at a height of about 16,000 feet, but the most truly Alpine of his expeditions were those in the extreme north-east of the country, which he explored in the neighbourhood of the Donkia mountain and pass, already several times mentioned. In these valleys situated at a height little lower than that of Mont Blanc, he had the prospect of pursuing his observations amidst the loftiest mountains and some of the largest glaciers of the globe, during the month of September, which he devoted to this purpose, notwithstanding the unconcealed jealousy of his friend the 'Soubah' who still hung on his footsteps. Even at this season, in the midst of the rainy season, broad unsnowed ridges existed at a height of 18,000 to 19,000 feet.

Shallow-valleys, glacier bound at their upper extremities, descend from the still loftier rearward mountains, and in these occur lakes.

. . . Above this, the valley expands very much and is a stony desert: stupendous mountains upwards of 21,000 feet high rear themselves on all sides, and the desolation and grandeur of the scene are unequalled in my experience. . . . I passed several shallow lakes at 17,500 feet; their banks were green and marshy, and supported 30 or 40 kinds of plants. At the head of the valley, a steep rocky crest 500 feet high rises between two precipitous snowy peaks, and a very fatiguing ascent (at this elevation) leads to the sharp rocky summit of the Donkia pass, 18,466 feet above the sea by the barometer, 17,866 by boiling point.' (Vol. ii. p. 122.)

The view from the Donkia pass (twice afterwards ascended by our travellers) is described as very impressive and extraordinary in the direction of Thibet. The Chalamoo lake, a piece of unfrozen water, nearly 17,000 feet above the level of the sea, and three or four miles in length, lay close to the spectators at the bottom of a rocky steep. Beyond it were mountains approaching 20,000 feet, but wholly unsnowed. These, however, (like the glacier-clad masses of Donkia and Kinchinjunga), do not form the axis or watershed of the range, which, however, is visible beyond the extensive valley of the Arun (a tributary of the Ganges), in the form of black rocky mountains, 'sprinkled with snow,' estimated at 20,000 feet of mean elevation. A still more distant, and no doubt much higher range rose behind these, loaded with snow, and far inland in Thibet, belonging, it is thought, to a chain altogether to the north of Yaru-tsampoo river, or Thibetan Burrampooter. This is the 'salt country' described as enormously lofty, perfectly sterile, and fourteen days' march for loaded men and burden-bearing *sheep* from Jigatzi (a station or village on the Yaru-tsampoo, a degree north from Donkia pass); where there is no pasture for the Yaks, whose feet are cut by the rocks. The salt is dug from the margin of lakes, as is the carbonate of soda. A distinct and well-executed lithograph gives a good idea of this part of the wonderful panorama: anything more desolate than the yellow red undulations of the highlands of Thibet, snowless at this excessive elevation, cannot be conceived.

Dr. Hooker ascended the slopes of the Donkia mountains, eastward of the pass to the height of 19,300 feet, which, so far as we observe, was the greatest elevation attained by him, and that without any peculiar difficulty. The temperature of the air on the three occasions on which he reached the pass was 42°, 49°, and 40°, therefore altogether pleasant, and snow only lay in hollows on the north side. We have observed that in

general, the relations of Himalayan travellers speak little of any properly Alpine difficulties to be overcome in performing these considerable ascents. Snow is often traversed, but glaciers or precipitous rocks rarely. This is to be explained by the fact that, great as these elevations are, they are, after all, only the *cols* or passes of these stupendous mountains; that they are usually selected for their facility, and that in far the greater number of cases, they are regularly traversed by beasts of burden. The ascent of the actual summits has very rarely, if ever, been tried. Their great distance from habitations, together with the rarefaction of the air, render them (as we have already remarked) probably unattainable, independent of mechanical difficulties. One result of this state of things is, that the volumes of Himalayan adventure contain few of those narratives of peril, and feats of personal activity, which interest the reader of Alpine tours. On the whole, where political obstacles do not interfere, these vast mountains appear capable of being traversed without much risk, although their vast scale of course renders such journeys costly and fatiguing, and necessitates the transport of provisions. Really bad or dangerous weather appears to be rare. In many parts of Thibet it scarcely rains or snows, and the traveller proceeds day after day with assured fine weather. Ponies or Yaks find their way almost everywhere; and whatever treachery may be suspected from the authorities, the guides and peasantry seem usually loyal and trustworthy, often devoted companions. These are very material aids in the exploration of unknown countries; and we can hardly doubt, after what has been done within a few years, that the wonderful physical geography of the greatest block of mountains in the world, invested with such an astonishing variety of climates, will ere long be more thoroughly known. The real difficulties will be found in traversing the sterile uplands of Thibet. Dr. Hooker's striking summary of his impressions of a survey of Thibet from the pass of Donkia forms an excellent commentary on the experience of the Romish missionaries who had penetrated into this country from China: —

‘There is no loftier country on the globe than that embraced by this view, and no more howling wilderness: well might the Singtam Soubah and every Thibetan describe it as the loftiest, coldest, windiest, and most barren country in the world. Were it buried in everlasting snows or burnt by a tropical sun, it might be as utterly sterile; but with such sterility I had long been familiar. Here the colourings are those of the fiery desert or volcanic island, while the climate is that of the poles. Never in the

course of all my wanderings had my eye rested on a scene so dreary and inhospitable. The "cities of the plain" lie sunk in no more death-like sea than Chalamoo lake, nor are the tombs of Petra hewn in more desolate cliffs than those which flank the valley of the Thibetan Arun.' (Vol. ii. p. 130.)

We pass over slightly the personal troubles which Dr. Hooker voluntarily shared with Dr. Campbell (whom he rejoined on the frontiers of Thibet), and who in his diplomatic capacity was disliked and feared by the Vizier or Dewan of the Rajah. The two friends were subjected to a month's imprisonment and other handsome treatment; but the end of the affair was wholly unfavourable to the Dewan, who was turned out of office and reduced to poverty. They returned to Dorjiling in December, 1850, where Dr. Hooker spent some months in well-deserved repose.

The remainder of the narrative in the second volume describes an expedition made chiefly on botanical grounds into a district quite distinct from the preceding, and, being under British rule, better known. It lies to the north-east of Calcutta, among the Khasia mountains, which are completely separated from the chain of the Himalaya by the vast valley of the Burrampooter river. Our author was accompanied by his friend Dr. Thomson, who had returned from the Western Himalaya and Thibet. Although subordinate in interest, as regards physical geography, these chapters are very amusing. He first describes the journey across the prodigious flats, little elevated above the level of the sea, which are traversed by the innumerable channels into which the Burrampooter river is divided. The flats are called the *Jheels* of Bengal, and though subject to perpetual inundation, and covered by rank vegetation, they are (strange to say) perfectly healthy. Fevers and agues are rare. This fact, at present, admits of no explanation. Part of the journey is performed by water, and the navigation, it may be believed, is abundantly intricate. 'We often passed,' says Dr. Hooker, 'through very narrow channels, when the grasses towered over the boats; the boatmen steered in and out of them as they pleased, and we were utterly at a loss to know how they guided themselves as they had neither compass nor map, and there were few villages or landmarks; and on climbing the mast we saw multitudes of other masts and sails peering over the grassy marshes, doing just as we did.' The exports of the Khasia mountain country, which adjoins the Jheels, are rice, timber, lime, coal, bamboos, and long reeds for thatching.

Arrived at the English station of Churra, our travellers commenced botanising in earnest, and appear to have revelled in

the luxuriance of a tropical flora. Twelve or fourteen natives were employed as collectors, and whilst travelling, thirty or forty more carry their booty. Here is a specimen of their proceedings:—

‘Near the village of Lernai oak woods are passed, in which the *vanda cerulea* grows in profusion, waving its pannicles of azure flowers in the wind. . . . We collected seven men’s load of this superb plant for the Royal Gardens at Kew, but owing to unavoidable accidents and difficulties, few specimens reached England alive. A gentleman who sent his gardener with us to be shown the locality was more successful; he sent one man’s load to England on commission, and though it arrived in a very poor state, it sold for 300*l.*, the individual plants fetching prices varying from 3*l.* to 10*l.* Had all arrived alive, they would have cleared 1000*l.* An active collector, with the facilities I possessed, might easily have cleared from 2000*l.* to 3000*l.* in one season from the sale of Khasia orchids.’

Of the *Vanda* preserved for botanical purposes ‘we had 360 ‘pannicles, each composed of from six to twenty-one broad pale ‘blue tessellated flowers, three and a half to four inches across, ‘and this formed three piles on the floor of the verandah each a ‘yard high. What would we not have given to have been able ‘to transport a single pannicle to a Chiswick fête!’ (Vol. ii. pp. 221-3.)

The climate of the Khasias is remarkable for the inordinate fall of rain; the greatest, we believe, which has been recorded. Mr. Yule, who is mentioned above, established the fact, that in the single month of August 1841, there fell 264 inches of rain, or twenty-two feet, of which *twelve and a half FEET fell in the space of five consecutive days*. This astounding fact is confirmed by Dr. Hooker and Thomson, who measured thirty inches of rain in twenty-four hours, and during seven months above 500 inches. This terrific rain-fall is attributed by our author to the abruptness of the mountains which face the Bay of Bengal, and the intervening flat swamps 200 miles in extent. The district (Churra) of the excessive rain is extremely limited. These facts illustrate the astonishing varieties of the Himalayan climate. But a few degrees further west (in Thibet), Dr. Thomson describes rain as almost unknown, and the winter falls of snow as seldom exceeding *two inches*.

Dr. Hooker describes the view of the snowy Himalaya, from the Khasia mountains, as wonderfully grand.

‘Northward, beyond the rolling (?) Khasia hills, lay the whole Assam valley, seventy miles broad, with the Burrampooter winding through it fifty miles distant, reduced to a thread. Beyond this,

banks of lazy vapour obscured all but the dark range of the Lower Himalaya, crested by peaks of frosted silver, at the immense distance of from 100 to 220 miles from Chillong. All are below the horizon of the observer, yet so false is the perspective, that they seem high in the air. The mountains occupy 60° of the horizon and stretch over 250 miles, comprising the greatest extent of snow visible from any point with which I am acquainted.' (Vol. ii. p. 290.)

If we rightly understand a passage which follows the one just quoted within a few pages (pp. 297—300.), the range just described is not, strictly speaking, *continuous*, but is broken up into groups, which our author describes as due to the circumstance that the snowy summits of the Himalaya do not correspond to the proper *axis* of the chain, but that snow accumulates chiefly on the lofty outlying spurs of mountains which branch to the southward, towards the plains of Bengal. The far easterly position of Khasia, and the sudden fall of the Himalayan range in that direction, give to this view in some measure the character of an *end* view of these mountains.

Dr. Thomson's volume, of which we have placed the title at the head of this article, along with Dr. Hooker's, may be disposed of in short compass. The pursuits of the two travellers were extremely similar, Dr. Thomson's being even more exclusively botanical than Dr. Hooker's; but they apply to almost opposite extremities of the Himalayan range, the district of the former being chiefly that of Kashmir and Ladak, that of the latter, as we have seen, Sikkim and Nepaul. The observations of both, however, extend from the plains of India to the high mountainous regions of Thibet, and refer to the analogous changes of climate and vegetation found in approaching the central mountains. But whereas Sikkim from its neighbourhood to the Bay of Bengal is damper, the districts of Kumaon and Ladak have a climate far more decidedly, continental. The same general law of the rise of the snow line from about 15,000 feet on the frontier mountains to the south, to 18,000 or even more, in the interior of Thibet, is accurately repeated in both countries: the same vast, arid, treeless, snowless undulations characterise the inhospitable regions of Thibet in both cases; and the cause of the rise of the snow line, namely, the dryness of the climate of the interior and the greater summer heat, appears to be precisely the same in both.

Dr. Thomson's country, though somewhat better known, presents greater physical difficulties of access, and belongs to a more intricate and involved group of mountains than

that visited by Dr. Hooker. Both travellers have improved the geography of their respective regions, and have traversed routes previously unknown to Europeans. Dr. Thomson's is a straightforward, unaffected narrative. But if wholly devoid of exaggeration or egotism, it is unfortunately deficient in the interest which a personal narrative and the power of animated description can alone convey. If Dr. Hooker's work have some deficiencies in this respect, in Dr. Thomson's they are far more conspicuous. The pages are loaded with botanical names and geographical details. Still the work is valuable as a contribution to our knowledge of this interesting country, and the routes are illustrated by an excellent map by Mr. Arrow-smith.

The valley of the Indus and its tributaries, containing the towns of Le and Iskardo, the former at a level of 11,800, the latter of 7200 feet, was the principal scene of Dr. Thomson's operations. This vast longitudinal valley separates the Indian Himalaya from the chain called by Von Humboldt, Kouenlun, which divides the part of Thibet subject to Indian rule from that under Chinese domination. That is the almost impenetrable country of Yarkand and Khoten. Dr. Thomson's principal feat consisted in attaining the pass of Karakoram on the summit of the Kouenlun, in latitude $36\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$, which, though frequented by caravans of merchants, and offering no peculiar difficulty, rises to a height of 18,200 feet in the midst of a vast uninhabited wilderness of a truly Thibetan character, not thoroughly snowed, but abounding (in the valley of the Thayuk, a tributary of the Indus,) with glaciers of gigantic dimensions,—in fact, apparently the most extensive which have been yet described except in the arctic regions. Glaciers also abound on the Himalaya south of the Indus, some of which are described in Dr. Thomson's work. All that is there stated on the subject of glaciers agrees well with what we have quoted from Dr. Hooker; but we shall here add an extract, in which Dr. Thomson very clearly explains his opinion on the very interesting subject of the formerly greater extension of glaciers towards the plains:—

‘In every part of the Thibetan mountains, and in very many parts of the Indian Himalaya, I have thought that I could recognise unmistakeable proofs of all the valleys having been formerly occupied by glaciers at much lower levels than at present. At first sight, it seems rather improbable that in sub-tropical latitudes, the present extension of perpetual snow should at any former period have been exceeded, but it would not be difficult to show that the mean temperature, and particularly the mean summer temperature, is very

much higher in the Western Himalaya and Thibet, than it might fairly be expected to be in such a latitude. . . . It is fair, therefore, to conclude, looking back to a period when the sea washed the base of the Himalaya in the upper part of the Punjab, that at that period a very different state of atmospheric circumstances prevailed from that which we find at the present time.

‘Wherever I have seen glaciers in Thibet, or the mountains of India, I have been able to trace their moraines to a level very considerably lower than their present termination; and when I find in those ranges of the Himalaya which do not at present attain a sufficient elevation to be covered with perpetual snow, series of angular blocks evidently transported, because different from the rocks which occur *in situ*, and so far as I can judge exactly analogous in position to the moraines of present glaciers, I feel myself warranted in concluding that they are of glacial origin. . . . In many places, I have seen them at least 3000 feet lower than the terminations of the present glaciers. In the valley of the Indus accumulations of boulders which I believe to be moraines, occur in Rondu as low as 6000 feet.’ (*Western Himalaya*, p. 478.)

Dr. Thomson further remarks, that the inferior level of glaciers depends not only on climate but on the mass of the glacier, and on its inclination; whilst on the Indian side of the range, the level is lower than on the northern and drier mountains of Thibet.

The ascertained fact (as we may consider it, since all recent travellers are unanimous on the subject), that the glaciers of India once extended to a far lower level, taken in connexion with similar facts, generally so interpreted in Europe, gives rise to many interesting reflections, on which we cannot here dwell. But the obvious conclusion seems to be, that no local cause, such as a change in the relative positions of sea and land, can account for an alteration of climate in the later geological periods, sufficient to explain the universal evidence of a comparatively recent glacial period extending its effects over the whole known world.

ART. III.—1. *Essai sur l'Economie Rurale de l'Angleterre, de l'Ecosse, et de l'Irlande.* Par LÉONCE DE LAVERGNE. Paris: 1854.

2. *The Rural Economy of England, Scotland, and Ireland.* By LÉONCE DE LAVERGNE. Translated, with Notes, by a Scottish Farmer. Edinburgh: 1855.

WHOMEVER visited the capital of France during the autumn of the past year, beheld an unexampled display of splendour in that opulent and luxurious city—of energetic and versatile genius in that brilliant people—of magnificence and power in the heart of that great empire. The streets and public buildings of Paris, renovated for the occasion by order of the Government, exhibited, in interminable vistas of admirable symmetry and taste, the most perfect effects which have been produced by modern architecture; for the completion of the Rue de Rivoli and of the Louvre mark an era in the decoration of the capital and in the history of art. In the Palace of Industry, and the group of temporary buildings collected round it in the Champs Elysées, the wealth, the invention, and the genius of all nations had accumulated their richest products and their rarest stores; and the most incurious could not but remark the rapid progress shown by almost all classes of competitors at this exhibition over the display of 1851 in Hyde Park. But, in this rapid advance of the age we live in, the growth of the arts of luxury and of refinement outstrips that of the humbler, though more necessary branches of human labour; and, although the Parisian Exhibition was rich in machinery, in agricultural implements, and even in the economical resources which have been introduced to improve the condition of the poor, the most extensive and ostentatious part of this vast collection seemed to have been created for the use of a wealthy aristocracy or a gorgeous court. We do not undervalue the taste, the artistic feeling, and the ingenuity lavished upon the comforts of a boudoir or the ornaments of a palace. They denote a high degree of civilisation, or at least of refinement; and they in some degree dignify the industrial arts. But they do not always represent, and still less do they increase, the real wealth of the community; and it is not impossible that a country which should produce incomparably the finest tapestries, porcelains, and furniture in the world, should still hold a low rank in those arts which are most essential to the welfare and ~~and~~ the existence of the people. In the midst of this Parisian fairy land, where the allied courts of France and England, and

the most cultivated persons of this age, seemed to have met for a holiday and a festival, scarcely interrupted by the distant sounds of war, and undisturbed by the threatening aspect of Europe, we were reminded by the official language of the 'Moniteur,' that the population of many of the departments of France is suffering from the horrors of scarcity; that the produce of the harvest in grain falls short of the estimated consumption of the next twelvemonth by at least seven millions of hectolitres; and that the Emperor of the French, surrounded by the homage due to the success of his people in the arts of peace and in the trials of war, is seriously embarrassed by the difficult problem of supplying such a deficiency in the food of the nation. To the existence and power of the French people, the mildew on an ear of corn, or the *oidium* on a bunch of grapes, or even the partial neglect of the great natural resources of their soil, is of more vital consequence than the splendour of the Imperial jewels, or the marvels of a thousand handicrafts. The stability of the political institutions of the country may be more powerfully affected by an insect in a blade of wheat than by all the magnificence which surrounds the throne; and, if a larger proportion of that intelligence and capital which are profusely expended in France upon the decorative and unproductive arts, could be turned to the elementary purpose of procuring food and clothing on the most advantageous terms for the service of man, Louis Napoleon might be surrounded by a less luxurious court, but he would rule over a more prosperous and contented people.

That portion of the productions and machinery of the United Kingdom, displayed in the French Palace of Industry, which appears most strongly to have interested the reflecting visitors of the Exhibition, and to have obtained for us an uncontested superiority over all rivals, consisted in the specimens, the drawings, and the machines illustrating the rural economy of England.* More than 400 specimens of the cereals of the United Kingdom, principally grown in the Lothians, and admirably classified by Mr. Wilson, now Professor of Agriculture in the University of Edinburgh, bore testimony to the triumph of the arts of cultivation over our ungenial climate and our rude Scottish soil. The system of our crops was completed by a few specimens of

* One of the first practical results of the Exhibition was a recommendation of the agricultural section of jurors, on the motion of Evelyn Denison, Esq., to obtain from the French Government a reduction of the duty on farm machinery; and these duties have been reduced by one-half accordingly.

artificial grasses, turnips, mangel-wurzel, beans, potatoes, and hops. Not a trace was to be seen of those innumerable products of the South, which give such richness and variety to the agriculture of more favoured lands. Corn, meat, cheese, and wool are the four articles on which the productive powers of British agriculture are concentrated, and the results obtained by modern farming are such as not only to prove highly beneficial to the community, but to eclipse in a very extraordinary proportion the agricultural produce and returns of the most favoured countries in Europe. It is no new proposition in husbandry that the steady perseverance of the North, assisted by the application of greater capital and of improved methods of cultivation, enables the rural population of those countries to obtain far more from the land than the South affords, with all its natural luxuriance and its varied crops of silk and oil, and wine, and Indian corn. The Department du Nord stands first in the agriculture of France, and we shall presently see, that in spite of the natural disadvantages of the soil and climate of the United Kingdom, we may claim, and undoubtedly possess, a vast superiority over the agricultural resources of almost all our Continental neighbours.*

The principal object of the volume before us is to demonstrate the truth of this assertion, and to explain the causes of it by a dispassionate comparison of the rural economy of Great Britain with that of France; and M. de Lavergne has executed this task with a high degree of ability, sagacity, and success. It is evident that the agricultural wealth of a country is the first test of its internal resources, of the condition of the people, and of the state of property. The object of all agriculture is to produce the greatest possible quantity of human food upon a given portion of the earth's surface, though this object may be attained directly by the cultivation of products edible by man, or indirectly by the cultivation of other articles, which subsequently increase the quantity of human food. When we find that in a

* Belgium would doubtless form an exception, but the Belgian harvest of the past year falls considerably short of the consumption of the population. The deficiency is estimated at about two million hectolitres of grain below the produce of an average year. This scarcity is in some degree compensated in Belgium, as well as in other parts of the Continent, by the superabundance of the last crop of potatoes. But for the purposes of human food a given quantity of potatoes is seven times less nutritious than the same quantity of wheat: and it deserves observation that a very large portion of the potato crop is now consumed in various manufactures, and so diverted altogether from the sustenance of man.

country like France, within less than ten years, the population has twice been rescued from the horrors of famine by extraordinary efforts on the part of the Government to obtain supplies of food from abroad, it must be inferred that the results of agriculture have not kept pace with the growth of population and the demands of the community. This is a fact which must exercise the most direct and decisive influence on the political and social welfare of the nation. It is not unlikely that in the course of this very winter France will suffer severely from the neglect of the natural advantages which she undoubtedly possesses. M. de Lavergne's practical and judicious observations on the rural economy of a neighbouring country, have therefore deservedly attracted very great attention on the Continent, and the agricultural portion of the Paris Exhibition produced there by British exhibitors has served to demonstrate the accuracy of his observations.

The Agricultural Survey of France, by Arthur Young, written before the Revolution of 1789, has retained, not only in this country, but even amongst the French economists, the rank of a classical authority. M. de Lavergne describes England and English husbandry with less of technical minuteness, and he rises more frequently from questions of agriculture to the considerations of a statesman. Before the convulsion of 1848, this gentleman filled an important position in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; he had just entered the Chamber of Deputies, and he seemed destined to play a useful and brilliant part in the constitutional government of his country. *Diis aliter* — the storm which scattered so many honourable ambitions and destroyed for a time the hopes of freedom, sent M. de Lavergne to seek refuge in the study of agriculture and the cultivation of his property: he filled for a time the Chair of Rural Economy in the Agronomical Institute at Versailles, till the jealousy of the Government suppressed that useful establishment; and he has now given a part of the results of his researches to his countrymen in the volume before us. These circumstances account in some degree for the enlarged treatment of the subject which we find in this Essay, and they recommend it to the notice of the politician and the philosopher. In this country, we have no doubt, it will be read with interest, but abroad, its influence cannot fail to be most valuable, because it corrects innumerable fallacies and delusions prevalent on the Continent, with reference to the actual condition of the rural districts of England.

The extent of land under cultivation in France bears to the land under cultivation in the United Kingdom the proportion of

three to two. England proper contains 13,000,000 of hectares*, a little more than a third of the total extent of the British Isles, and one-fourth of that of France. M. de Lavergne at once admits that France does not possess an equal extent of well-cultivated land to oppose to it. Some detached districts, especially in French Flanders, may rival us; some may surpass us in fertility, but '13,000,000 hectares equal in cultivation to the 13,000,000 hectares of England, France does not possess' (p. 3.). Yet neither the soil nor the climate of these islands can claim any preeminence over the continental states. On the contrary, some of our most fertile counties, such as Lincoln, were formerly mere fens and marshes, and the system of agriculture which has made the fortune of England sprang from the sandy soils and bleak atmosphere of Norfolk. Nor can we impugn the justice of our author's sentence, when he says,—

'It is the same with the climate. British agriculturists have known well how to avail themselves of the peculiarities in their climate, for in itself there is nothing very seductive about it. Its mists and rains are proverbial; its extreme humidity is little favourable to wheat, which is the prime object of all cultivation; few plants ripen naturally under its dull sky; it is propitious only to grasses and roots. Rainy summers, late autumns, and mild winters, encourage, under the influence of an almost equal temperature, an ever-green vegetation. Here its action stops; nothing need be asked of it, which demands the intervention of that great producing power, the sun.

'How superior are the soil and climate of France! In comparing with England, not the fourth only, but the north-west half of our territory—that is to say, the thirty-six departments grouped around Paris, exclusive of Brittany—we find more than twenty-two millions of hectares, which surpass in quality, as they do in extent, the thirteen millions of English hectares. Scarcely any mountains; few natural marshes; extensive plains, sound almost throughout; a soil sufficiently deep, and of a nature most favourable to production; rich deposits in the broad valleys of the Loire and Seine, with their tributaries; a climate not so moist, but warmer—less favourable perhaps to meadow vegetation, but more suitable for ripening wheat and other cereals; all the productions of England obtained with less trouble; and, in addition, other valuable products, such as sugar, textile and oleaginous plants, tobacco, wine, fruits, &c.'

Arthur Young had arrived at a similar conclusion after his agricultural tour in France. He pronounced that country to be superior to England as regards soil, and not less so

* We have retained for convenience M. de Lavergne's French admeasurements. The *hectare* is nearly 2 acres and a half; the *hectolitre* is 2.75 Imperial bushels; the *kilogramme*, 2 lbs. 3 ounces.

with regard to climate; but he added, 'We know how to turn our climate to the best account, and the French in this respect are still in their infancy.' In spite of these natural advantages it may be shown to demonstration that England is better cultivated and more productive over an equal surface than the north-west of France; that the lowlands of Scotland at least rival the eastern departments; and that even Ireland, poor as it is, is richer in production than the south of France. These are the propositions advanced by M. de Lavergne; indeed they may be carried even further, for the superiority of the agricultural wealth of the United Kingdom will be found, on a strict comparison, to be not only relative in proportion to its area, but positive. The evidence of these facts and the causes to be assigned for them form the subject of this inquiry.

It may be said that it is scarcely possible to institute an accurate comparison between countries differing so essentially in their rural economy. The agriculture of the United Kingdom presents, with scarcely any exception, a monotonous uniformity, and the whole system of English farming may be described as consisting in a large extent of natural or artificial pasture; two roots, the turnip and the potato; two spring cereals, barley and oats; and a winter one, wheat—linked together in a series of crops destined exclusively for the sustenance of animals and of man, or in other words for the production of meat, beer, and bread.

'France can show a certain number of crops almost unknown among our neighbours, and these extra productions with us have to be added to those we both have in common. Such, for instance, is the vine, a source of wealth belonging especially to our soil, covering not less than five millions of acres, and producing at least 4*l.* the acre; then again, rape, tobacco, sugar-beet, madder, the olive, and mulberry; and, finally, two and a half millions of acres of gardens and orchards, from which fruit, vegetables, and flowers are obtained in great abundance. The sum of these productions amounts in annual value to at least a milliard (40,000,000*l.*).

'These are unquestionable sources of wealth, which partially redeem our inferiority, and may do so to a still greater extent, for there is no limit to their production. The diversity of our climate, and, what is more, our national genius, which naturally aims at quality in variety, as that of England seeks quantity in uniformity, give us promise of immense progress in those crops which, to a certain extent, are dependent on art. We have not yet shown all we can do in this respect; our labourers, like our mechanics, by means of improvements and novelties, can compensate for our deficiencies in amount of production.

'Still, it is impossible to be blind to the fact that, as matters stand, the English, with their two or three crops upon a large scale, pro-

duce, by the universality and simplicity of the means they employ, much superior results in the aggregate—results which we also obtain in particular parts of France where the same system is followed. Those of our departments most resembling England in the nature and distribution of their crops, are those also which attain, upon the whole, the best returns.’

It has sometimes been argued that this variety of the productions of the soil of France is the principal cause of the deficiency in the primary objects of agriculture, corn and meat, and that in particular too large an extent of land had been of late years appropriated to the vine and to the growth of beet-root destined for the production of sugar under the shelter of the protective laws which exclude the direct competition of colonial sugars. But this statement has been exaggerated. The vineyards of France have not increased to any considerable extent in the last sixty years, and they cover about 2,000,000 of hectares; a great portion of this soil is unfit for the production of corn, and in supplying the beverage of the nation they correspond in effect to the light barley lands of the British Isles. The depression of the rural interests of France and the privations of the whole population have been greatly aggravated for the last few years by the extraordinary ravages of the *oidium* or vine disease, which have impaired one of the principal sources of national wealth in the Southern Departments and raised to famine prices the wine and spirits forming an essential article of popular consumption. Sir Emerson Tennent, in his ingenious and unanswerable Essay on the Wine Duties, has shown by authentic statistical data the prodigious extent of this calamity. The average production of wine in France has steadily fallen off from *fifty-one* millions of hectolitres in 1848 to *ten* millions of hectolitres in 1854, and the vintage of 1855 is said to be equally deficient. Bordeaux and the Gironde grew 2,000,000 hectolitres in 1848 and 300,740 in 1854. So that the production has fallen off at least four-fifths in the last years. The contracts for wine for the French army and navy had doubled and trebled in price in 1854; and from the difficulty of obtaining wine at all suitable for the troops Marshal St. Arnaud found it necessary to substitute a double ration of coffee and sugar. In Paris and all the principal towns of France the retail price of common wines has risen 100 per cent., and the quality is proportionably deteriorated. The quantity of spirits produced from the grape has decreased to a similar extent, though it has been found necessary to distil a larger quantity of the poorer wines to obtain the same amount of brandy. Spirits have also been distilled in

France from beetroot, and in 1854 802,019 gallons of rum and British spirits were exported to France from the United Kingdom.

The average value of the production of the vineyards of France is estimated by M. de Lavergne at 20,000,000 sterling: of this total amount we have seen that of late four-fifths have failed; but allowing for the large increase of value in the wine made, the direct loss to the vine growers may be 10 or 12,000,000 sterling: the loss to the consumer, however, is almost equally great, since he pays a far higher price for an inferior article; and we believe that Sir Emerson Tennent estimates the actual loss to France from the failure of the vintages of 1854 and 1855 at fully 20,000,000 sterling per annum. It is obvious that this cause alone must produce very great distress in many parts of the country, and it reacts in various ways on the whole agriculture of France by compelling the population to find substitutes for their usual beverage, and thus disturbing the existing laws of supply and consumption and increasing the prices of other commodities.

The cultivation of the beetroot in France for the purpose of extracting home-grown sugar is undoubtedly a losing operation, since a better article is procured in the colonies at a lower price, but the whole extent of land under beetroot is computed at only 50,000 hectares—a thousandth part of the area of France—and this root serves, even after the extraction of the saccharine matter, for the nourishment of cattle. The most extensive and exhausting of the exceptional crops of France is that of the *colza* or rape, for the preparation of oil, which covers 1,000,000 hectares of excellent wheat land, to the prejudice of sound farming and to the serious detriment of the production of corn. In this country, on the other hand, no important crop is allowed to interfere with the supply of the staple articles of meat and bread.

It is worth while to follow this comparison in greater detail, and to trace the contrast to its original source, which is to be found in the live-stock of the two countries. The first thing which strikes a foreigner in crossing England is the enormous proportion of sheep fed on farms of almost every quality, and the evident superiority of the British breeds of this animal. France and England are believed to contain about an equal number of sheep—35,000,000; but the sheep of the United Kingdom live upon 31,000,000 of hectares, those of France on 53,000,000; this disproportion is far greater if England proper be compared to France; exclusive of Scotland and Ireland we support on the same area three times as many sheep as the

French farmers. The objects for which sheep have been bred for the last century in the two countries are again totally different. In France, the main object of Louis XVI., when he introduced from Spain his celebrated Rambouillet merinos, was to improve the growth of wool; about one half of the French sheep at the present day are merinos or half-bred merinos. England, on the contrary, has long ago abandoned the propagation of the Spanish breeds. The celebrated Leicestershire sheep introduced by Bakewell owed its deserved popularity in the first instance to the precocity of its growth and the weight of its carcase. The Southdowns have been improved by the same process during seventy years of skilful treatment, and we have arrived at a sheep which at two years old gives an average of 80 to 100 lbs. net of mutton. Nor, in the meanwhile, have our wools deteriorated under the competition of our own Australian colonies. The production of wool in the United Kingdom is estimated by M. de Lavergne at 60,000,000 of kilogs., and is equal to that of the whole of France (his Scottish commentator affirms it to be as 72 is to 60), whilst the weight of meat from the animals slaughtered in this country is immeasurably greater, because the English sheep attains its maturity in half the time required by its French rival. From these calculations it follows that 35,000,000 French sheep produce annually 60,000,000 kilogs. of wool*, and 144,000,000 kilogs. of meat; whilst 35,000,000 British sheep produce at least the same quantity of wool and 360,000,000 kilogs. of mutton.

'It is easy to foresee how this result, which appears already so great for the British Isles, becomes enormous when speaking of England alone. England feeds two sheep per hectare, whilst the average for France is only two-thirds of a head; and the produce of the English sheep being besides double that of the French, it follows that the average return of an English sheep-farm is six times greater than a French one.'

The history of French horned cattle is a continuation of that of French sheep, and a singular contrast to that of the mighty stall-fed beasts of England. France possesses 10,000,000

* In computing the value of the wool, hides, tallow, and offal in the two countries, M. de Lavergne estimates them both in France and in England at twelve millions sterling. It is, however, doubtful whether the average of the wool grown in France equals that of the British Isles in price. French wool in the northern and western departments is about the same in value as our inferior Wiltshire or Kentish; in the south only it rivals the finer wools of Spain.

head of cattle; England and Wales 5,000,000; Scotland 1,000,000, and Ireland 2,000,000: but nothing is more opposite than the breed, the destination, and the results of these animals. Cattle are valuable to man in four ways—for their labour as beasts of draught, their milk, their meat, and their manure. A French ox is expected to work for his living; the British bullock lives and dies in the *otium cum dignitate* of pastures and oil cake. In other words, the first use to which this animal is turned in France, is farm-labour, which is slowly and wastefully performed. For similar reasons, although France possesses 4,000,000 of cows, and the United Kingdom 3,000,000, three fourths of the French cows are not milch cows at all, as almost all the English cows are. The produce of our dairies (especially in cheese) is incalculably greater than that of France, both in quantity and value; and one of the causes which contribute to this result is no doubt the practice of rearing calves for the table, which prevails on the Continent far more than in England, where veal is justly regarded as the most uninteresting and unprofitable of meats.

‘The consumption of milk under every form is enormous among the English. Their habits in this respect are those of past ages. Cæsar said of them, long ago, *Lacte et carne vivunt*. They are not in the habit of preparing their food with fat and oil, like most of the French, but use butter for all culinary purposes; cheese, too, appears at their principal repasts. The quantities of butter and cheese manufactured throughout the whole extent of the British Isles exceed all belief. Cheshire alone produces cheese to the value of a million sterling, or twenty-five millions of francs annually. Not content with what their own dairies give, the English import butter and cheese from abroad; and this circumstance, showing to what extent the national taste is carried, explains the reason why it is that the average price of milk with them is higher than in France. While our producers obtain at most ten centimes per litre (1d. per quart) for their milk, the English get twenty centimes (2d.).

‘In fine, the milk produce of English cows may be reckoned at three milliards (three thousand millions) of litres, of which one milliard goes to feed the calves, and two for the consumption of man. This gives an average of about one thousand litres for each cow. The production of France is probably at most two milliards, or at the rate of five hundred litres per head, of which at least one-half is consumed by the calves.

‘Thus, while the French have only one milliard of litres to sell for human consumption, the English have two; and as, in consequence of their large manufacturing population, they obtain double the price for their milk that we do, it follows that the dairy produce of England is worth four times as much as it is in France. The

production of the two countries should, then, be represented by the following figures:—

‘France, 1 milliard of litres at 10 cents, 100 million francs (4,000,000*l.*).
British Isles, 2 milliard of litres at 20 cents, 400 million francs (16,000,000*l.*).’

There is no doubt that animals bred for labour and fattened after some years of hard work, produce a race of inferior quality for the butcher; and M. de Lavergne declares that ‘the working of horned cattle, whether necessary or not, entails a loss instead of being profitable.’ Yet that loss falls to the lot of almost every French peasant who has a yoke of oxen to his plough. The effect of these mistaken arrangements on the weight and value of the meat killed is most striking.

‘The comparative results of the two systems may be stated as follows:—

‘In France the number of cattle annually slaughtered is four millions, producing a total of four hundred million kilogrammes of meat, at the rate of one hundred kilogs. average weight. Official statistics make it only three hundred millions.

‘In the British Isles the number annually slaughtered is two millions of head, giving a total of five hundred million kilogrammes of meat, at the average of two hundred and fifty kilogs.

‘Thus with eight million head of cattle, and thirty million hectares, British agriculture produces five hundred million kilogs. of beef; whilst France, with ten million head, and fifty-three million hectares, produces in all only four hundred million.

‘This disproportion is perfectly explained, independently of the difference in race, by the difference in age of the animals slaughtered. The French cattle are slaughtered either too soon or too late: the paramount necessity for maintaining cattle intended for labour obliges us to kill a great number of calves at that age when growth is most rapid. In our four millions of head figure two and a half millions of calves, which, on an average, give not more than thirty kilogs. of meat; those that survive are not slaughtered until an age when growth has long ceased—that is to say, after the animal has for several years continued to consume food which has not served to increase its weight. The English, on the contrary, kill their animals neither so young, because it is when young that they lay on flesh most rapidly, nor so old, because then they have ceased to increase: they seize the precise period when the animal has reached its maximum growth.’*

* These calculations have been made with care but with extreme moderation, and it must be remembered that to the disgrace of this country we possess no comprehensive and accurate statistics of our agricultural produce. Mr. Spachman gives the value of butchers’ meat of all kinds slaughtered in the United Kingdom in 1851 at five millions sterling. This is probably an exaggeration; but it was ascertained by the Smithfield commission that the value of the cattle alone sold in the metropolitan market was nearly five millions.

It is unnecessary for us to dilate on the superior merits and value of English horses of almost every kind, though the French have undoubtedly some breeds of horses, especially the Percheron and the Béarnais, of wonderful hardiness, strength, and agility. Our pigsties produce at least double the amount of hams and flitches which can be found in France, where indeed the pig generally looks like a guilty and despised fugitive. On the other hand, we have no hesitation in awarding the palm to the *basse cour* of France. Her poultry stands in lieu of a multitude of rural deficiencies; whilst in this country, in spite of the recent invasion of gigantic and strident fowls from Cochin China, poultry is the luxury of the rich. The *poule au pot* enjoys amongst our neighbours the traditional celebrity reserved amongst ourselves to the fitch of bacon. Under circumstances the most discouraging, there is not a traveller but has found in crossing the less frequented regions of France, that a satisfactory repast might after all be made with a roast chicken and an omelette. In France the annual value of eggs alone is estimated at 4,000,000*l.* sterling, and nearly 1,000,000*l.* worth are imported from the Channel ports to this country.

This deficiency in live stock, and the inferiority of French husbandry in breeding and fattening cattle for the butcher, is a fact of primary importance, not only to the progress of agriculture, but to the entire social condition of France. With a soil and population exceeding that of the United Kingdom by at least one-fourth, we have seen that the actual head of cattle maintained in France is hardly more numerous than that of this country, and very far below the produce of the animals fed in this country as regards weight of carcase and rapidity of growth. The first consequence of this state of things is to impoverish the husbandry of the empire. In France a much smaller proportion of the soil is laid down in those pastures, roots, and artificial grasses, which are especially used in rearing and fattening cattle; a larger proportion of the soil is under corn, but as the supply of natural and artificial manures is far less abundant than in Great Britain, the production of the lands under tillage is considerably less. For a similar reason, the rotation of crops being imperfectly understood and practised, except upon the most antiquated system, about one-eighth of the arable land is left fallow in each year; and following the same train of causes and results, the returns of the land are proportionably low, and the produce of the land for the sustenance of man proportionably less than in this country. The radical condition of the four-year course of Norfolk husbandry is

that the exhausting crops should invariably be followed by those which invigorate the soil, and in such wise that the latter is to the former in a proportion of nearly three to one. Thus out of 19,000,000 of hectares under cultivation in the British Isles, M. de Lavergne calculates that 15,000,000 are devoted to the growth of food for live stock, and at most 4,000,000 to that of man; but in France only 9,000,000 hectares are appropriated to ameliorating crops, whilst the exhausting crops occupy double that area. This calculation reserves only twenty per cent. of land in England to the production of corn. It appears from the agricultural statistics published last year (for eleven counties) that there are about 570,000 farms in England and Wales averaging sixty-four acres each.* Of these sixty-four acres twenty-six are under tillage, twenty in grass, and eighteen in houses, gardens, roads, wood, and waste. Of the twenty-six acres under tillage six and a half acres grow wheat. Under the influence of the present high prices of corn, farmers have been very generally led to lay down a greater breadth of wheat during the past year, which is estimated by Mr. Caird at one fourth increase. It is evident that one of the advantages of the system of British agriculture is that a large extent of land, capable of producing corn is, as it were, held in reserve, and that upon the occurrence of scarcity, the natural effect of high prices is to bring a larger area of land under cultivation for the food of man. French agriculture possesses this resource in a very inferior degree, for it can neither much extend the area of cereal cultivation, nor improve the condition of the land under it. Indeed the first condition of an increase of corn in France would be to reduce the area which produces it. For the experience of British agriculture has shown that the French agro-

* In these inquiries we are met at every step by the want of agricultural returns which can be relied on. In Scotland some progress has been made by the enlightened exertions of the Highland and Agricultural Society and of their Secretary, Mr. Hall Maxwell. The experiment which was begun in the counties of Roxburghshire, Haddingtonshire, and Sutherlandshire in 1853, has now been extended with some success to the whole northern portion of the island. But in England the attempt to obtain voluntary statistical information has failed, and the machinery employed for the purpose proves insufficient. Out of 570,000 blank schedules which were issued only 450,000 were returned filled. In Berkshire, for instance, out of 4300 schedules, 1800 remained unanswered. In Norfolk only the returns were tolerably complete. This is a subject which has already been considered by a Committee of the House of Lords, and the extreme importance of it calls for the interference of the Legislature.

nomical division of the soil is infinitely less profitable for all the purposes of food and subsistence than that prevailing in this country, and to convince his countrymen of this fact is one of the principal objects of M. de Lavergne's writings. The cultivated lands of the British Isles produce much more food for cattle than the whole of France, although they comprise only two thirds the extent of soil; the quantity of manure is proportionably three or four times greater; the operations of husbandry are more complicated and more productive; machinery has been largely introduced to assist them; commerce lends them her aid by fetching fertilising substances from distant parts of the world; and the same causes which lead to this extraordinary development of animal life, contribute not less powerfully to stimulate the production of those plants which are necessary to the existence of man.

'With us (in France) the average production is thirteen and one-half bushels of wheat and eleven of rye per acre, deducting seed. Adding to this maize and buckwheat, and dividing the whole by the number of hectares sown, the average result for each acre is rather more than seven bushels of wheat, about three bushels of rye, and a little more than one bushel of maize or buckwheat—making a total of about twelve bushels per acre. In England the production is twenty-eight bushels of wheat—say more than double in quantity, and in money value three times as much. This superiority is certainly not to be attributed, as in the case of the natural and artificial meadows and roots—and, to a certain extent, also with oats and barley—to the soil and climate, but to superior cultivation, which shows itself chiefly in limiting the wheat crop to the extent of land rendered fit for its production.

'Scotland and Ireland are included in the above estimate; but taking England by itself, the results are much more striking. That small country, which is no larger than a fourth of France, alone produces thirteen million quarters of wheat, six of barley, and twelve of oats. If France produced in the same ratio, her yield, deducting seed, would be fifty million quarters of wheat, and seventy of barley, oats, and other grain—equal to at least double her present production; and we ought to obtain more, considering the nature of our soil and climate, both much more favourable to cereals than the soil and climate of England. These facts verify this agricultural law—that, to reap largely of cereals, it is better *to reduce than to extend the breadth of land sown*; and that by giving the greatest space to the forage crops, not only is a greater quantity of butcher-meat, milk, and wool obtained, but a larger production of corn also. France will achieve similar results when she has covered her immense fallows with root and forage crops, and reduced the breadth of her cereals by several millions of hectares.'

If we follow these calculations into the gross produce and returns of the agriculture of the two countries, we find that

'France, taken as a whole, produces 100 francs per hectare, England proper produces 200. The animal produce alone of an English farm is equal to at least the total produce of a French farm of equal area—all the vegetable production being additional. Taking only the three principal kinds of domestic animals—sheep, oxen, and pigs—and not taking poultry into account, the English obtain from these four times more than we do in butcher-meat, milk, and wool. Among the vegetable products, whilst the French soil does not produce quite one hectolitre and a half of wheat per hectare, the English soil produces three; and it gives, besides, five times more potatoes for human consumption.'

'By the census of 1841, the total population of the United Kingdom was 27,000,000 of souls, and that of France 34,000,000. Thus while the United Kingdom maintained nearly one head per hectare, France maintained only one per hectare and a half.'

Or taking the money value of the agriculture of the two countries,

'With respect to the average value of the land, which is usually estimated by its productiveness, that of England proper was worth 40*l.* per acre, or 2500 francs per hectare; and the rest of the United Kingdom, exclusive of the Highlands of Scotland, about one-half of this figure, or 1250 francs. The Highlands of Scotland, with their uncultivated lands, were worth, at most, 2*l.* per acre. Deducting 20 per cent. from these prices, we obtain for England an average of 32*l.*, for the Highlands 32*s.*, and 16*l.* for the rest of the United Kingdom.

'The cultivated lands of the northern half of France may be worth, on an average, 24*l.* per acre, and those of the southern half 16*l.* Valuing the 8,000,000 hectares of uncultivated lands at 2*l.*, and the 8,000,000 of forest grounds at 10*l.*, we find a general average of 16*l.* per acre.

'Thus a comparative examination of agricultural products, the number of the population, and the money value of the land, all combine to prove, upon the most moderate estimates, that, previously to 1848, the product of British agriculture, taken as a whole, was to the product of French agriculture over an equal surface as 135 to 100; and if we compare England alone with the whole of France, the former produced at least twice as much as the latter.'

It is evident that if these conclusions are correct (and we apprehend that M. de Lavergne has been led to underrate rather than to overrate the productive powers of British agriculture, in the absence of an authentic system of agricultural statistics), they materially affect the wealth and the social condition of France. They show that the supply of food raised from the soil of that fertile and favoured land is not only far below that which is obtained under less favourable natural conditions in this country; but that the population must of necessity be more scanty, and with inferior kinds of food; and that the profits of

husbandry are considerably below the standard they have reached in this country.

The scientific researches recently published by M. Payen of the French Institute on the public alimentation of France confirm in a striking manner the inferences drawn by M. de Lavergne from the condition of French husbandry. To use a familiar expression, the French nation *have not enough to eat* even to supply the natural wants of the human frame, and this deficiency is especially marked in relation to animal food. M. Payen has calculated that the whole amount of the animal food consumed annually in France, including meat, fowls, fish, cheese, eggs, &c., is 980 millions of kilogrammes, which, divided amongst the population of the empire, gives 28 kilogrammes per head per annum, or only 76 grammes—about one-sixth of a pound—per diem. The average consumption of the whole population ought to be 160 grammes per diem, or 58 kilogrammes per annum, so that the actual supply of animal food to the French people is barely half what it ought to be. The consumption of meat by the English navvies employed on the Rouen Railway was 660 grammes, or one pound and a quarter per diem, which is an enormous allowance: but there is no doubt that the average consumption of meat by the population of Great Britain is far greater than that of the French, and it would be interesting to ascertain how far the physical deterioration of the standard of growth among the French is the result of an inadequate supply of nutritious food.

To complete this comparison of the rural economy of England and France M. de Lavergne enters upon the question of the burdens on land, rents, profits, and wages in both countries—a subject of extreme difficulty from the dissimilarity of almost all the conditions under which land is held in France and in Great Britain. Land in France is free from the charges of poor rates and tithes, but it supports a heavy land tax and duties of succession and registration, from which the real property of this country is, or was till a very recent period, exempt. Wages are somewhat higher in England, but 30 English labourers will do the work of 40 French ones, and the English labourer is accustomed to be better clothed, better lodged, and better fed than his neighbour across the Channel. Rent in England is computed by M. de Lavergne at double the average of rents of France, and the profits of land south of the Tweed at three times that of his own country.

These extraordinary differences are undoubtedly attributable to a great variety of causes, amongst which the progress of scientific agriculture, the expenditure on the land of large

amounts of capital derived from other sources, and the energy of the people claim the first place. But it must be confessed that the political and social condition of England during the last sixty years has been far more favourable to the successful cultivation of the soil than that of France. Within that period two or three generations of an opulent and intelligent race of country gentlemen and farmers have gone on steadily to promote the work of improvement in this country; whilst in France the soil has been torn from the hands of its former proprietors, confiscated, parcelled out anew, subjected to the injuries of invasion and to the shocks of repeated internal revolutions. On the basis of a highly democratic state of society it is probable that the subdivision of landed tenures among the peasantry is one of the best countervailing forces to the instability of the government, but it can hardly be shown that this condition of the soil tends to develop its productive powers or to promote the agricultural wealth of the nation. M. de Lavergne argues the disputed question of large and small landed estates with great candour and moderation; and the first result of his inquiries is materially to abate the exaggeration which prevails on the Continent as to the concentration of landed property in England, and the exaggeration which prevails in England as to the subdivision of landed property in France. It is difficult to persuade foreigners who are superficially acquainted with this country, that the lands of Britain are not exclusively entailed upon the favoured descendants of the Norman barons; it is equally difficult to persuade Englishmen that there are still in France many estates equal to those of our landed gentry. M. de Lavergne says,

‘In France there are about 100,000 landed proprietors who pay upwards of 300 francs of direct taxes, and whose fortunes average those of the mass of the English proprietors. Of these, 50,000 pay 500 francs and upwards. Estates of 500, 1000, and 2000 hectares are frequently to be met with, and territorial fortunes of 25,000 to 100,000 francs and upwards of rent are not altogether unknown. We may have probably about 1000 large proprietors, who for extent of domain rival the second grade of English landlords, by far the most numerous of the class. It is true we have proportionably fewer of them than our neighbours, and immediately following our chateaued gentry swarm the host of small proprietors, whilst the English gentry have on their backs the immense fields of the aristocracy. To this extent, at only to this extent, it is correct to say that property is more concentrated in England than it is in France.

In France, dowries to married daughters reconstitute in part what the law of succession destroys. In England, if real property is not divided, movable is; and in a country where personal property is

so considerable, this division cannot fail, through sales and purchases, to exercise an influence upon the partition of fixed property. The more rapid increase of population with our neighbours, is, in its turn, another element which distributes property. In fact, properties are being constantly divided in England, and, every day new country residences are constructed for new country gentlemen; at the same time, many properties are being reconstituted in France, and the assessment returns show that the increase in the number of the large is greater than that of the small.

It is rash to affirm by any general proposition that large or small properties promote or restrict the production of agricultural wealth. The result depends altogether on the circumstances of the case. In the county of Sutherland the Duke's vast estates are far more productive to his tenantry and to himself than if they were subdivided between a few thousand Highland tacksmen; but in the Island of Jersey, where the land is tilled like a garden, the soil is profitably farmed in the smallest possible holdings at enormous rents.

One other cause of the acknowledged superiority of British husbandry may be noticed in connexion with the tenure of land. In England and Scotland, the farmer generally holds his lands of the owner subject to precise covenants which he cannot break, and which impose upon him that system of cultivation which science and experience have shown to be best adapted to the permanent advantage of the soil, and he has claims on the landlord to enable him to carry this system into effect. The mutual stipulations of two interested parties compel both of them to adhere to certain rules. In France the farmer is far more frequently the proprietor of his farm, but in that capacity he is at liberty to do whatever his ignorance, his prejudices, or his pressing interests suggest. The probability is that this course is frequently at variance with that which the permanent benefit of the land would prescribe.

Another of the most important causes of the progress and superiority of this country in its rural economy is the constant reaction upon the land of wealth derived from other sources of commercial and manufacturing enterprise, and the tendency inherent in our society to perpetuate in the form of landed property all that is most prized by Englishmen. The love of the country, with its manly sports, its healthy pursuits, its local administrative occupations, and its preponderating share of political influence, is one of the chief characteristics of English life. Who shall say how much these influences and these pursuits serve to mitigate the heat of party warfare, to sober the vehemence of ambition, and to assign a career of modest usefulness

to a large class of our countrymen? In no other country has so much of the best energy and intelligence of the nation been directed to the advancement of rural economy, and in no other country have the same results been obtained. We are not disposed to renew the discussion—long since concluded alike by argument and by experience—of the necessity of protection to British agriculture, but if any further proof were required of the utter superfluity of such protective laws we should find it in this testimony of an impartial foreign agronomist to the indisputable superiority of the condition and productions of the land in this country; and if we could pause to examine the more deeply seated causes of the stability of our institutions, they might be traced to the same elements as those which have promoted our rural economy. In 1848 Europe was startled, and France was shaken with a paroxysm of terror, by the discovery that formidable agrarian discontent existed in that country, and that the Revolution, no longer confined to the streets of Paris or Lyons, threatened the rights of landed property itself in many of the rural departments. One or two years of scarcity had preceded that convulsion; the people had suffered great hardships; and it is extremely probable that the insufficiency of food from the inadequate cultivation of the soil was one of the causes which again let loose upon France the calamities of a revolution. Two hundred years ago the agriculture of France was more advanced than that of Great Britain, and during the 17th century France constantly exported corn to this country. But from the Revolution of 1688 and the War of Succession the current turned. England has never ceased to advance in population, in wealth, and in agricultural produce; France, on the contrary, fell into a condition of misery which was perfectly frightful, and which broke forth at last in the tempest of 1789. The Marquis d'Argenson wrote in 1739,

‘The real evil—that which undermines the kingdom, and cannot fail to bring ruin upon it—is, that at Versailles they shut their eyes too much to the distressing state of things in the provinces. In my own day we have observed a gradual decrease of wealth and population in France. We have the present certainty that misery has become general to an unheard-of degree. While I write, in the midst of profound peace, with indications, if not of an abundant, at least of an average harvest, men are dying around us, like flies, of want, and eating grass. The provinces of Maine, Angoumois, Touraine, Haut-Poitou, Périgord, Orléanais, Berry, are the most wretched, and the distress is advancing towards Versailles. The Duke of Orleans lately laid before the Council a piece of bread, which we got for him, made of ferns: in placing it upon the king’s table, he said, “*Sire, here is what your subjects live upon.*”’

No doubt the changes of the last half century have immensely improved the condition of France, and probably none of the larger states of the Continent have advanced more rapidly; but the race of population against food is an incessant struggle, in which life itself can only be sustained by the exercise of the whole intelligence and energy of man; and amongst the elements of success not the least important are freedom and good government. A member of the constitutional party in France may be permitted to say with authority,

‘It is perfectly evident, then, that both in France and England agricultural development has followed in the train of good government. The rural change which took place in France between 1760 and 1848, had already taken place in England between 1650 and 1800; the producing causes in both cases were the same. The difference between England under the Stuarts and in the time of Pitt, is the same as that of France under Louis XV. and Louis Philippe. But this does not apply to France and England alone. In ancient as well as in modern times, agricultural prosperity came and went with the mode of government. Republican Rome cultivated its fields admirably; enslaved Rome neglected them. Spain, during the middle ages, did wonders in cultivation, while the Spain of Philip II. ceased to work. Switzerland and Holland fertilise rugged mountains and hopeless marshes; the Sicilian starves on the most fertile soil. As Montesquieu remarks, in his *Esprit des Loix*, “It is not fertility but liberty, which cultivates a country.”

‘The true ballast of the body politic—the salt of society, that which holds it together—is the country feeling. This feeling, no doubt, is of an aristocratic kind, but it is not aristocracy itself; both may exist independently. British aristocracy has made common cause with the country feeling, and this is what constitutes its strength; French aristocracy holds itself aloof from it, and herein lies its weakness. In England, the country life of the upper classes has, in the first place, produced energetic and high-minded habits, out of which the constitution has taken its rise; and then, owing to these very habits, liberty has been prevented from running into excesses. This liberal and conservative element has been wanting to us in France. In our own day as formerly, absenteeism has effected, even in a political point of view, nearly all the mischief; and this is the reason why these two apparently distinct causes of prosperity—liberty without revolutions, and the country feeling—are really but one.’

Our limits forbid us to accompany M. de Lavergne on his agricultural excursions through the British Isles, though we do not remember to have met with a pleasanter guide; but to one point we propose briefly to direct our attention, because this volume enables us to produce the evidence of a competent and impartial witness on a subject which is perpetually and grossly misrepresented—we mean the condition of the Highlands.

Whatever may be said of British agriculture is of course true *à fortiori* of that of Scotland, and we venture to affirm that the present century has nowhere witnessed more beneficial changes than in the Highland counties of Scotland. But we are told these changes have been brought about by the brutal depopulation of the country; that the great Highland proprietors prefer sheep and deer to men; and that to increase their rentals they have sacrificed their clansmen. To corroborate these statements, it is said — and we do not dispute the fact — that the Northern counties, which had for the last century supplied a constant succession of the hardiest and bravest troops to the British army, can now barely be persuaded to raise a company of militia; and that the source of those valiant Highland regiments has been extinguished by an illiberal and impolitic persecution. It is not difficult to show that the original facts are thus entirely misstated, and consequently that the inference drawn from them is totally erroneous.

M. de Lavergne has given his readers a very dispassionate account of the past and present condition of the Highlands. There was a time, when although the Highland population did not exceed 250,000 or 300,000 souls scattered over 10,000,000 of acres, the scanty produce of the uncultivated soil was still insufficient for the subsistence of these mountaineers. They supplied by rapine what they could not obtain by industry, and the progress of the race was arrested by frequent famine and perpetual war. In such a state of things military service was the most welcome resource of this people. The Highlanders of the last century belonged to those who

‘ their stormy mansion tread,
And force a churlish soil for scanty bread;
No product there the barren hills afford,
But man and steel, the soldier and his sword.’

But their condition in their own glens was that half-savage state of which Mr. Macaulay has just given to the world so vivid a picture. Conquest and the advance of civilisation gradually changed this life of privation and of insecurity. Since 1745, the Highlanders have borne an honourable part in the achievements of the British army, and they continued to furnish large bodies of recruits throughout the last war; but in the exact proportion in which their wants have been satisfied, their wealth increased, and their education improved, they have shown more taste for agricultural labour and less eagerness for the profession of arms. It is altogether incorrect to state that in the course of the last half century the population of the Highland counties has decreased: on the contrary, it has largely increased, as will

be seen from the following particulars taken from the Census returns:—

	1801.	1811.	1821.	1831.	1841.	1851.
Inverness	72,672	77,671	89,961	94,797	97,799	96,328
Ross and Cromarty	56,318	60,853	68,762	74,820	78,655	82,625
Sutherland	23,117	23,629	23,840	25,518	24,782	25,771
Argyle	81,277	86,541	97,316	100,973	97,371	88,567

But this progress of the population has been accompanied by a far more rapid increase in the wealth of every class in the Highlands. The breed of sheep and cattle has been greatly improved, and those counties which at the commencement of this century barely provided a subsistence for their inhabitants, now ship off large quantities of live and dead stock by regular steamers, to the Southern markets. The farms along the coast of Ross-shire and Sutherland would not disgrace the Lothians; and their produce amply remunerates the landlords and tenants who have combined capital and industry for their improvement. Probably, there is no part of the kingdom in which the labouring agricultural classes live in greater prosperity, for the demand for labour is extreme, and wages are proportionably high. The progress of cultivation may even be traced steadily ascending to the corries of the hills, and converting swampy and unsheltered moors into pasture, wood, or arable land. With these employments, with these advantages before him, the Highlander of 1855 has few of the temptations or the privations which converted his forefathers into freebooters or soldiers of fortune. The recruiting-serjeant has but little attraction for a man who can earn fifteen or eighteen shillings a week; and the apparent abatement of military ardour amongst the Highland population is in truth no proof that this population is less brave or less numerous than of old, but simply that from being the most poor and wretched portion of our fellow-countrymen, it is now rapidly becoming one of the most independent and prosperous. These are the results of what were termed the clearances of the Highland estates, which consisted in the removal of a set of human beings from a condition little better than that of beasts to a state in which they have had every incitement to industry and success. M. de Lavergne has done justice to the wisdom, foresight, and humanity with which the late Mr. James Loch conducted these important operations in Sutherland, and to the

benefits they have conferred not only on the Duke of Sutherland and the other great Highland proprietors, but on every inhabitant of that country. He has utterly confuted and exposed the misrepresentations to which M. de Sismondi gave currency on this subject; and he has established to demonstration the fact that an insufficiency of production, owing to the neglect of an enlightened system of rural economy, is but another name for barbarism, and constitutes one of the greatest dangers to which society can be exposed. Europe has long given the people of England credit for maritime enterprise, and for skill in the manufacturing arts; but M. de Lavergne is the first traveller who has shown that results of equal importance have been obtained by the application of capital, science, and industry to our rural economy, and that the tastes and interests of a very large portion of the British nation are quite as closely linked to agriculture as they are to our naval power or our commercial activity. This fact entitles his book to a most favourable reception amongst us.

ART. IV.—*Das Leben des Ministers Freiherrn vom Stein.* By G. H. PERTZ. Berlin. 6 vols. 8vo. 1849-1855.

IT is to be feared that few English readers will master a Life of Baron Stein, extending over six closely printed octavo volumes; but those who have leisure for the task, will find that Mr. Pertz is not only a biographer, but a valuable contributor to modern history. The most important part of his work relates to the final coalition against Napoleon, and to the subsequent transactions of the Congress of Vienna: but the whole of Stein's public career is interesting in itself, and it is recorded by the learned editor of the '*Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*' with conscientious and characteristic fidelity. The narration connects the existing political condition of Europe with a state of society which has almost wholly passed away. The high-born baron of the Holy Roman Empire, the active member of the administrative hierarchy established by Frederick the Great, took a prominent part in the overthrow of Napoleon, and in the political arrangements which still regulate the relations of the European Powers. The history derives unity and interest from Stein's marked and commanding individuality. No German statesman of recent times has been regarded with so universal a feeling of deference and respect. Correspondents of his own rank appear habitually to have addressed him as a

superior. Royal personages received him almost as an equal, and often submitted in silence to his rebukes.

Hot-tempered, impetuous in language and in action, he gave frequent and just offence to all with whom he was brought in contact: but the genuine greatness of his nature is shown by the love and esteem which he commanded notwithstanding his defects. It is not surprising that women of superior understanding and cultivation should have been peculiarly attracted to his society. Men are less indulgent or more susceptible; and it is evident that the rough and domineering manner, which accompanied Stein's vigorous character, offered many impediments to his success in the ordinary intercourse of business. But, if he made enemies unnecessarily, he had many persevering friends, who returned to him again and again, even when they had been repelled by his harshness or injustice. Time softened to a great degree his asperities of temper, while it relieved them by a humorous consciousness of eccentricity. In his later years the aged statesman became comparatively courteous and amiable. That some of his early warmth remained under the ashes may be inferred from a conversation with Niebuhr at Rome. Stein had thought proper to remonstrate with his friend for absenting himself from the administration of the sacrament, and also for suggesting as an excuse some feeling of animosity, probably against his official superior Prince Hardenberg: '*Herr Geheimrath*,' he said; 'you know we must forgive our enemies.' 'Why,' urged Niebuhr, 'your Excellence hates Count A.' 'Hate him!' replied his Excellence, 'No — but if I met him in the street, I would spit in his face.'

Henry Frederick Charles, Baron Stein of Stein (*von und zum Stein*), was born in 1757, at his father's castle of Stein, in Nassau. The youngest of four brothers, he was selected by the partiality of his mother as representative of his wealthy and ancient house. The family compact by which this singular and unjust arrangement was carried out, provided that the chosen heir alone should marry, while the daughters were only to ally themselves with families as noble as their own. Two of them had the good fortune to comply with the condition: the third, Baroness Marianne, became Canoness and eventually Abbess of the Protestant Cloister of Wallerstein, in Homburg. The Barons of Stein held a high rank among the immediate nobility of the Rhine. Their principal estate of Nassau had passed from father to son for nearly 700 years. The Minister was the last of his race. 'In him,' says his biographer, 'the ancient stem attained its perfection and its close.' M. Pertz seems to forget

that three vigorous buds had been pruned away to make room for the consummate flower.

Stein's position as a reigning baron, holding *in capite* of the German Crown, exercised a strong influence on his political opinions. The immediate nobility, in common with the free cities and with the ecclesiastical princes, had for ages opposed the attempts of the great feudatories to complete the disruption of the Empire. The allegiance of a Baron Stein was naturally given neither to Nassau nor to Prussia, but to Germany. No statesman advocated so earnestly at Vienna the restoration of the old German kingdom, even though the Imperial sceptre must have been entrusted to the unworthy hands of Francis of Austria. The name of Stein suited well the solid and angular character of its owner. In after years the laborious fancy of literary patriots delighted to work out the coincidence in detail. In many a lumbering verse they celebrated the *Ur-Stein* of primeval granite, the *Grund-Stein* on which the fabric of freedom was to be built, the *Edel-Stein* the brightest jewel in the Crown, and the *Eck-Stein* at the head of the corner.

Even Mr. Pertz's industry has failed to discover materials for the history of Stein's earlier days. At the University of Göttingen he appears to have devoted himself to the study of history and politics, especially in the works of English authors. Through life he professed himself a disciple of Adam Smith, though in practical conclusions he often violated the principles of his master. Almost alone among his contemporaries, he preserved to the last the religious faith of his childhood. The concentration of his vigorous intellect on subjects of more immediate interest seems to have neutralised the attraction of those philosophical speculations which had already begun to agitate the German universities. His personal conduct was, according to his own testimony, unusually strict and regular. Many years afterwards, the Duke of Saxe Weimar, observing Stein's disapproval of the freedom with which he had spoken on certain moral questions, attacked him individually, — 'Come, Herr Minister, you know very well, you were no better than the rest of us, when you were young.' 'In the first place,' Stein replied, 'that is not true. If it was, it would be no business of your highness; and I think it highly unbecoming in a German prince to talk so laxly in the presence of a set of young officers.'

It was the custom of the eighteenth century, which is still far from obsolete, a German chose his country as he selected his profession. Stein's father occupied a post at the Electoral Court of Mayence. The eldest of his disinherited sons, a

knight of the German or Teutonic Order, became a soldier and diplomatist in the service of Prussia. The second, also a knight of the Order, won distinction in the Austrian army. The third, after holding a French commission, fell into poverty and disgrace. Charles von Stein had been destined by his family for the position of an Aulic Councillor at Vienna; but admiration for Frederick the Great, and a family connexion with the Minister Von Heinitz, determined his choice in favour of the Prussian civil service. In 1780, at the early age of twenty-three, he was appointed a Referendary in the Department of Mines and Foundries, over which Heinitz at the time presided. Under Frederick, even high-born aspirants to office were compelled to work in earnest. Attendance on lectures in mineralogy, geology, and chemistry, were as indispensable as the daily task of recording the decisions of the board. The king's minute attention to details is curiously illustrated by his hesitation in confirming Stein's appointment, after two years' service, as a member of the board. '*Oberbergrath!*' he said to Heinitz, 'that is a little too much (*ein bisgen viel*): what has he done to deserve it?' The minister was, in this instance, enabled to satisfy his master; but administrative reformers will probably admire the interference of the Sovereign in the appointment of an unalaried third-class clerk. The collapse, however, of the Prussian monarchy under Frederick's commonplace successors, shows the fundamental unsoundness of a constitution which requires the constant superintendence of a man of genius.

In 1784, Stein entered on a sphere of provincial activity, in which he was occupied for twenty years. The post of Superintendent of Mines in Westphalia, with a seat in the local Government, first gave him an opportunity of displaying his rare administrative powers. In 1788 he was promoted to a higher rank in his department; in 1793 he became President of the Board of War and Domains for the County of Mark and for Cleve. In 1796 he was appointed President-General (*Oberpräsident*) of all the Westphalian Boards. The various duties of these offices were not unlike those which are discharged by the English civil servants in India. The Councillor of Mines was charged with the management of the public coal mines and iron works. The functions of the Director of Domains included the management of roads, rivers, and factories. The Chief-President of Westphalia governed a district containing half-a-million of inhabitants, collecting the revenue, making the roads, improving the navigation of rivers, and superintending the police. It is said that Stein's public works are still re-

membered in Westphalia: but it is not probable that official management of mines and factories can ever rival the achievements of private enterprise. Stein was esteemed the most accomplished administrator of his time; but his long experience led him to the conviction that the Prussian system of official interference was thoroughly defective and wasteful. In his later life he lost no opportunity of denouncing bureaucracy and *paperasserie* (red-tapism), or of dwelling on the comparative cheapness and efficiency of the less elaborate State machinery which is employed in England.

If Stein had preferred diplomatic employment to an administrative career he might easily have satisfied his ambition, for so early as 1784 he was employed in a negotiation of some importance with the Elector of Mayence. The internal politics of Germany on the eve of the great revolutionary war appear strangely obsolete; but the transactions which are fully recorded by Mr. Pertz are interesting to the historical student. The Ecclesiastical Archchancellor of the Empire had, by the injudicious policy of Joseph II., been detached from the interests of Austria. In common with the other Princes whose position was menaced, the Elector turned to Prussia, where the aged king was still determined on maintaining the balance of power which his arms and policy had first established. Confident in his alliance with Catherine II., and in his family connexion with Louis XVI., the Emperor was rapidly encroaching on the rights of the German potentates, and on the franchises of the cities; and for the second time he was planning the incorporation of Bavaria into his hereditary States. Stein was employed, on the recommendation of Heinitz, to sound the Court of Mayence with respect to the League of which Frederick had determined to become the head. The young diplomatist was opposed by the French Minister, Count O'Kelly; by the Austrian Trautmannsdorff; and by the Russian Romanzoff, son of the Marshal, and afterwards himself Chancellor of the Empire. The negotiation, however, was simplified by the eagerness of the Elector to accept the offered support of Prussia. It was only necessary to preface the conclusion of the business by the proper affectation of delay and mystery, and to conduct with fitting activity the intrigues with male and female courtiers, which were indispensable preliminaries to any princely decision. The Ecclesiastical States presented the additional peculiarity, that every successive incumbent was expected, as at the Vatican, to reverse the policy of his predecessor. It was expedient, therefore, in obtaining the assent of the Elector, to win over his successor, Baron von Dalberg. The attempt was

unsuccessful, inasmuch as the cautious prelate had nothing to gain by pledging himself to the cause of Prussia. At a later period Dalberg's devotion to Napoleon was rewarded by the Grand Duchy of Wurtzburg, and by the Primacy of the Confederation of the Rhine. His heir, the Duke of Dalberg, when French ambassador at the Congress of Vienna, proposed to pay a visit to Stein; but the Minister took little pains to conceal his antipathy to a Dalberg who had condescended to become a Frenchman. 'Tell him,' was the answer to the courteous overture, 'that if he comes as ambassador from the King of France, he shall be welcome; if he visits me in his private capacity, I will have him pitched down stairs.'

In 1802 the bishopric of Münster was divided among several of the neighbouring princes, the largest share falling to Prussia. Stein was charged with the apportionment of territory, and with the organisation of the new province; a thankless task, as the inhabitants were naturally dissatisfied with the transfer of their allegiance, and suspicious of a Protestant Government. The Prussian commissioner, however, although himself a member of the reformed confession, entertained the most cordial feelings to the rival Church. The Dean of Münster, Count Spiegel, afterwards Archbishop of Cologne, used his influence in the chapter and in the district to allay the public dissatisfaction; and many of the principal functionaries willingly transferred their services to their new superior. During the short remainder of his Westphalian administration Stein resided principally at Münster, where he shared the occupation of the episcopal palace with the commander of the forces, General Blücher. His provincial career terminated with his appointment, in 1804, to the post of Minister of Finance.

Innumerable proofs of the energy and ability which had been for twenty years employed in promoting the interests of the province, may be found at length in the pages of Pertz. Few heads of departments have governed so vigorously, or effected so many administrative reforms. Above all his other qualities, Stein was distinguished by his skill in the selection of subordinates, and by success in making himself obeyed. Beloved and feared, he had in his countenance and character 'that which men would fain call Master — authority.' His reprimands were singularly plain-spoken. In a minute preserved by his biographer, a public functionary is recorded as chargeable with 'a malignant coarseness (*gallichte grobheit*), which exposes him to the hatred of his inferiors, and to the contempt of independent observers.' 'The brutal conduct' of the delinquent is attributed to ignorance and presumption; and he is not unrea-

sonably menaced with the loss of an office which he discharges with 'misanthropic bitterness and illegality.' It must be remembered, in justice to the Chief President, that his strong language was by no means used exclusively in dealings with his subordinates.

It is to be regretted that there is little record of Stein's private and domestic life. In 1792 he married Countess Wilhelmina Walmoden, daughter of the Hanoverian general of that name, who was himself a son of George II. and Lady Yarmouth. The courtship was free from romance, as became a match so equal and suitable. The business-like method of German marriages prevailed over the fervid and impetuous temper which the lover often exhibited on occasions of less importance. In a letter written in the manner of 1792, he informs his correspondent, Madame von Berg, that he is anxious, before making up his mind in favour of Countess Wilhelmina, to see a certain Charlotte Diede, whom his sister strongly recommends. In September the Walmoden star is in the ascendant. Madame von Berg is requested to excuse him from a visit to Berlin, because he intends to marry before the spring—'Probably it will be Countess Wilhelmina Walmoden, unless I find something very extraordinary at Ziegenberg; then I shall take a tour in Switzerland.' The fair Charlotte was not destined to accompany the tourist. Wilhelmina finally triumphed in December; and it is satisfactory to find that on the whole their marriage was reasonably happy. The young Baroness Stein discharged faithfully her duties as a wife and as a mother; and her husband, who had always respected her, finally learned to love her with all the tenacity of his serious and earnest nature. On her premature death she left two daughters; but the male line and the ancient name of Stein became extinct.

In 1804 Stein succeeded his old patron, Heintz, in the Prussian Ministry of Finance. The King hesitated long before he placed in so important a department a functionary whom he respected for his ability, but disliked on account of his originality and independence. Frederick William III. entertained a truly royal antipathy to genius; but he was conscientious, and open to conviction. His cabinet counsellor, or private secretary, Beyme, succeeded in overcoming his objections, and the new minister speedily satisfied all observers of his pre-eminent fitness for his office. Within a few months the excise was readjusted, the salt duties were placed on a new footing, the removal of numerous transit dues established an internal system of free trade; and the whole machinery of revenue was examined, checked, and readjusted. A clear-headed financier

and vigorous administrator could desire no better fortune than to find himself endowed with ample powers and surrounded by innumerable practical solecisms in economy. The removal of abuses which have checked the natural development of prosperity, is equivalent to the discovery of new sources of wealth. It is only necessary to break down the dam and the water will find its proper level. There was, however, little leisure in 1804 and 1805 to draw out the hidden treasures of Prussia. It soon became necessary to provide for the demands of an imminent war, instead of legislating for the ordinary condition of the country. At the same time Stein was induced by circumstances and inclination to rise above the sphere of administrative activity, and to claim his natural place in the first rank of contemporary statesmen.

The cowardice of 1805 had been avenged by the rashness of 1806. The sophists and traitors who had prevented a rupture when the quarrel might have been fought out with the aid of Austria, shrank from resisting a hopeless struggle when the fear of popular indignation began to outweigh the dread of a foreign enemy. Napoleon himself, though certain of victory, could scarcely have anticipated the ease with which it was to be achieved. The army of Frederick the Great was broken at Jena and Auerstadt, and disgraced by the eager rivalry of the numerous garrisons to surrender the fortresses entrusted to their care. On the 20th of October, Stein, after securing the funds of his department, left Berlin, with other members of the Government, to join the King at Königsberg.

He had not waited for the catastrophe to express his opinion on the policy of the State; but his title of Minister implied no power of interference with the general conduct of affairs. Frederick William I. and Frederick the Great had adapted their administrative machinery to their own practice of immediate personal government; and their system was retained by their feeble successors. The number of ministers varied from time to time, but in general four of their body managed as many provinces, while others conducted special departments extending to the entire monarchy. There was no council to give the chief public functionaries the support of a corporate existence, nor had they severally the right of direct communication with the sovereign. The King received reports and conveyed his orders through his cabinet of private secretaries, consisting at this time of Beyme and of the notorious French partisan Lombard. Haugwitz became, by a close alliance with Lombard, practically chief minister, and directed the foreign policy of the country. The confused and perilous condition of

public affairs proved the necessity of a change. It was of the utmost importance to substitute an organised body of statesmen for a government of venal parasites and courtiers. In 1806 Hardenberg, then Franconian minister, was negotiating with England, while Haugwitz was still identified with the policy of France.

Stein determined on making an effort to convince the King of the necessity of reform. His position was at this time strengthened both by his great official reputation and by his social relations. He was on terms of intimacy with the King's brothers, with Prince Louis Ferdinand, and especially with his sister, Princess Louisa of Prussia, and her husband, Prince Anthony Radzivil. In the army Blücher, Rüchel, and Phull cordially shared his views. Hardenberg was hostile to the person and policy of Haugwitz. Finally, Stein's early friend, Madame von Berg, was high in the confidence of the Queen. With characteristic boldness, after much discussion, he determined to act alone; and on the 10th of May he delivered to the King one of the most plain-spoken memorials which has ever been presented to an absolute monarch. The proposal to substitute for the government by departments a responsible and deliberative council of ministers, however distasteful, could scarcely have been thought offensive. The singularity of the manifesto consisted in a series of vigorous personal criticisms on the actual advisers of the Crown—Haugwitz and the two private secretaries. The writer, admitting that Beyme was a man of sense and a respectable lawyer, nevertheless complained that he was presumptuous, ignorant of political economy, and corrupted by his connexion with Lombard. It further appeared that Madame Beyme was vulgar and conceited. Lombard, according to Stein, was a cripple in mind and body, an ignoramus, familiar only with French dilettantism (*schöngeisterei*). 'His moral sense is destroyed by early profligacy, and he has attained to a perfect indifference between good and evil. The diplomatic relations of the State at a crisis unparalleled in modern history, are entrusted to the unclean hands of a low-born French poetaster, a corrupt crippled *roué*, who spends his time in gambling and debauchery.' Nor did Haugwitz fare better. The King was informed that his confidential minister was shallow and incapable, fawning and sneaking (*süßlich, und geschmeidig*). He had been a *theosophe*, a ghost-seer, a disciple of Lavater, a profligate, and a gambler; he had basely betrayed the woman who lived with him; he was incapable of veracity, and a mere broken-down man of pleasure. The remainder of the memorial consisted of a scheme for the

establishment of a council of ministers, and included an ill-considered self-denying clause, pledging its author not to accept any promotion consequent on a change.

The King, as it afterwards appeared, not unnaturally resented an application so unusual in form, and so little flattering to his own judgment in the selection of advisers. For the time, however, Stein's services were indispensable, and his memorial was left unanswered. A second remonstrance, signed not only by the Minister, but by the Princes, and by some of the Generals, was answered by a sharp reprimand. The King's patience was still not exhausted, but he had yet to learn the pertinacity of his haughty Minister of Finance.

On the flight of the Court from Berlin the ministry was broken up; and on Beyme's recommendation the King offered Stein the department of Foreign Affairs. The reply consisted in a repetition of the arguments in favour of an independent cabinet, in a peremptory demand for the dismissal of the secretary, and in a recommendation of Hardenberg for the post of Foreign Minister. A curious negotiation, fully recorded by Pertz, failed to lead to a favourable conclusion. At the beginning of January, 1807, on the night before the retirement of the Court to Memel, Stein received a royal autograph not less remarkable for distinctness of language than his own memorial. 'I had prejudices against you once,' the King began with an honest abruptness. 'I always considered you a man of reflection, talent, and capacity, but at the same time I thought you eccentric and original (*genialisch*); a person, that is, who always considers his own opinion right, and is therefore unsuited to a post where he is liable to be irritated by collision with others. I overcame these prejudices, as I have always striven to select public servants on reasonable grounds, and not by personal caprice.' 'You refused the foreign portfolio in a bombastic disquisition. . . . I gave way; and to meet your views as to the necessary improvements in the conduct of business I issued, on the 17th of December, the order which, I *suppose*, you are acquainted with. I say *suppose*, for your persevering silence, which, at first, I attributed to your health, must otherwise remain wholly inexplicable.' In a first draft the King had written: 'I cannot attribute your silence to mere defiance and disobedience, for if I did I should be obliged to provide a suitable lodging for you' (*i. e.* to order an arrest). 'From all this I see with great regret that I was not mistaken at first, but that you are to be regarded as a perverse, contumacious, obstinate, and disobedient public servant, who pluming himself on his genius and talents (*auf sein genie*

‘und seine talente pochend), far from keeping the good of the State before his eyes, acts under the influence of passion and of personal animosity and irritation. . . . I am really hurt that you have forced me to speak so clearly and plainly. As, however, you profess to be a lover of truth, I have told you my opinion in plain German (*auf gut Deutsch*); and, I must add, that unless you think fit to change your disrespectful and unbecoming conduct the State cannot reckon much on your further services.’

It is, perhaps, on the whole, convenient that the rulers of mankind should either control their tempers, or consult the dignity of their position by the ordinary formal circumlocutions; yet it is a relief to meet, for once, with a State paper written in plain English or *gut Deutsch*. The Minister and the King afterwards understood each other better; but, for the time, reconciliation had become impossible. Stein instantly replied, by a letter which recited the most offensive parts of the royal missive, and concluded by the tender of his resignation. The King answered that he had nothing to add to Baron Von Stein’s judgment on himself. A request for a formal release from office was left unnoticed. Not only the generals and statesmen who supported the national cause, but the friends and allies of Prussia, considered the fall of the Minister a public calamity. The English envoy, Lord Hutchinson, expressed his regret in the strongest terms, and made no secret of his suspicion that the King’s advisers were not to be trusted.

During the course of the spring an overture on the part of Niebuhr, who was himself inclined to enter the service of Russia, induced the Emperor Alexander to offer Stein a similar invitation. The ex-Minister was impatient of leisure, and well disposed to accept the proposal; but, less hasty than his friend, he asked for farther information before he returned a positive acceptance. The correspondence, however, was not completed, when events occurred which rendered the negotiation useless for the time. During the conferences at Tilsit the French Emperor insisted that Hardenberg, who had recently obtained the confidence of the King, should be dismissed, as hostile to French supremacy. In answer to an expression of helplessness on the part of Frederick William, the conqueror carelessly replied, ‘Prenez le Baron de Stein, c’est un homme d’esprit.’ It was convenient that there should be a man of business, in the position of a superior prefect, to extract the enormous contributions which were imposed on the remaining provinces of the monarchy. Napoleon could not

know that he had named the man who, of all German statesmen, was most fully determined to throw off the foreign yoke. After an unsuccessful application to Schulenberg, who afterwards degraded himself by serving Jerome Bonaparte in Westphalia, the King offered Stein the Ministry of Finance and of the Interior. The patriotic party remembered with anxiety the breach which had so recently occurred. Hardenberg and Blücher wrote to urge the acceptance of the King's offer. Niebuhr thought that Stein would undertake the task, but characteristically despaired of his success. Princess Louisa Radziwill, relying on her long and warm friendship with the ex-Minister, wrote an admirable appeal to his generosity and patriotism. Stein himself never for a moment hesitated. The personal offence which he had resented had received full atonement, and the public need of his services superseded all personal considerations. No other public man possessed the same knowledge of business, though Niebuhr was perhaps more intimately familiar with the details of finance and currency. No other statesman—not even Hardenberg—possessed in an equal degree the confidence of the nation. With well-judged magnanimity he abstained from imposing conditions on his sovereign. 'I leave to your Majesty,' he said, 'all arrangements as to the conduct of affairs, or to the persons with whom I am to transact business.' The despatches had found him ill with an intermittent fever; but the excitement of his new position rapidly restored his strength, and in a short time he was able to commence his laborious journey to Memel.

The extraordinary energy of Stein's short administration has been more generally recognised than other portions of his public activity. His task was by no means hopeful. No European country has been exposed, since the Thirty Years' War, to the sufferings which the French occupation entailed on the residuary provinces of the Prussian monarchy. A territory containing 5,000,000 of impoverished inhabitants was compelled to maintain a foreign army of 160,000 men, while every officer followed at due distance the example of the generals and marshals who took the opportunity to amass fortunes for themselves. Among many satraps Soult was, as usual, preeminent in cupidity, while Davoust was more remarkable for ferocity. Victor alone, among the commanders of high rank, remembered what was due to himself and to humanity. The General-Intendant, Daru, was charged by his master with the duty of raising the largest contributions which could be obtained, and of putting forward impossible demands for the purpose of prolonging the French occupation. Independently of supplies to the army,

and of private extortions, the payments imposed on Prussia down to the end of 1808, amounted to 20,000,000*l.* The new Minister found himself in a position which, however difficult, was highly favourable to the exertion of his energies. The King treated him with a degree of good faith which won his permanent respect and esteem. The Queen soon learnt to regard him with friendly cordiality. The Princes, and still more the Princesses, of the Royal family were among his warmest friends. He was surrounded by able men of business in the capacity rather of subordinates than of colleagues. Schön and Niebuhr acted under his directions. The Provincial Minister Schrötter gave an active support to his internal reforms; and he had the satisfaction of seeing Scharnhorst and Gneisenau already engaged in their measures for the regeneration of the army.

There is but a partial foundation for the popular belief which attributes to Stein the abolition of serfdom in Prussia. The measures which were subsequently carried out, had been prepared by Schrötter before the arrival of the Chief Minister. The government had long before commenced a similar policy; and Stein himself had, to a certain extent, carried on the task during his Westphalian administration. Throughout the vast domains of the Crown, serfage proper (*leibeigenschaft*) had been abolished by the first king of Prussia in the early part of the eighteenth century. Private landowners, in many districts, possessed serfs; and villenage (*eigenbehörigkeit*) was, in all the provinces, a common tenure. As the peasant, in the majority of cases, possessed a hereditary right to his land, the question of enfranchisement presented little difficulty in principle. The commutation of personal services into money or lands, together with the enclosure of commons, rendered the transaction, in most instances, beneficial to all parties. Joseph II. had carried out a general measure of the same kind in the Hereditary States. The Constitutional Assembly in France had adopted the easier and ruder plan of a summary confiscation of feudal rights. In recent times the policy of commutation has been adopted by the Austrian government in Galicia, and by Kossuth and his colleagues in Hungary.

The servile tenure of the peasantry was by no means the only anomaly which could be removed with obvious economical advantage. The possession of land in almost all parts of this kingdom was clogged with a curiously inconvenient mass of obsolete restrictions. There were lands which could only be held by nobles, lands which could only be held by citizens, lands which could only be held by peasants. Where no equally rigid pro

hibition existed, the nature of the proprietorship varied according to the condition of the heir or purchaser. Many of the privileges belonging to a knightly property (*rittergut*) were extinguished or placed in abeyance, if the tenement passed into the hands of a commoner. It was generally illegal either to subdivide or to consolidate peasant properties. The manorial domain and the dependent farms were kept rigidly apart. A legislation which had aimed at protecting each class against the encroachments of the rest, had deprived all of their natural freedom of action.

After carefully considering the plans of Schrötter, and the amendments suggested by other members of the Government, Stein embodied his decision in an edict which was published by the king on the 28th of October, 1807. Every inhabitant of the monarchy, without distinction, was thenceforward authorised to hold land in full possession. Vassalage (*guts-unterthänigkeit*), villenage, and serfdom were to be abolished after an interval of three years; while the limited or perpetual term of every occupier in his holding was to remain unaltered. Owners of entailed estates were enabled to grant leases; and means were provided of cutting off entails by family compacts. Notwithstanding the pedantic objections of Niebuhr, who wished by artificial legislation to maintain a population of peasant proprietors, facilities were offered, under certain restrictions, for the consolidation of farms. On the other hand, owners were permitted to alienate portions of their lands, or to dispose of the entire estate. It may be doubted whether an equally important measure was ever introduced or carried out with equal facility. The abuses which were removed by the royal edict had only been preserved by the general indisposition to change, combined with the reluctance of the nobility to part with even useless privileges. The catastrophe of 1806 and 1807 reconciled all parties to reforms, judiciously devised, to improve a state of affairs which could scarcely be deteriorated. A vigorous minister at such a crisis naturally becomes a dictator: but the abolition of serfage and villenage in all parts of Europe has been accomplished with comparative ease—*temporis magis partus quam ingenii*. In England, the system had died out of itself three or four centuries before it began to disappear from the Continent. The measure which is most popularly associated with the memory of Stein was one of the simplest achievements which distinguished his official career.

Few statesmen have combined the preparation of so many systematic reforms with an equally active superintendence of pressing business. An elaborate system of administrative or-

ganisation, embracing every department of the State, had not been finally adopted when the Minister was removed from office. He had, however, introduced a municipal constitution for all considerable towns; and he drew up a still bolder project for a general Representative Assembly. Having, after a short interval, added to his other functions the management of foreign affairs, Stein employed an intelligent agent—Sack—to treat with Daru at Berlin, and despatched the king's brother, Prince William, to Paris with Alexander von Humboldt as his adviser. In the meantime he strained every nerve to raise the funds which were required. The multiplicity of measures which he devised for the purpose proved his untiring energies and the variety of his resources. Russian coins were made a legal tender. By Niebuhr's advice, bank-notes were accepted at their current value in payment of taxes. The corporations of nobles in various provinces were induced to guarantee bills issued by the Government. The Estates of West Prussia voted an income-tax. The Mark of Brandenburg, and some other provinces, raised their quota by a property-tax. In defiance of many plausible objections, the Minister determined to sell crown-lands to the value of two and a half millions sterling. He employed Prince Wittgenstein to sound the miserly Elector of Hesse as to the possibility of a loan; and he sent Niebuhr on a similar mission to Amsterdam. The personal relations of that great scholar and able financier to his chief had become less easy from the time when his objection to the consolidation of small freeholds was overruled. Their friendship still continued; but the Minister and the Councillor of State were at the same time opposed in temperament and equally irritable. The sanguine and impetuous vigour of Stein jarred on the timid and desponding disposition which made his subordinate one of the most impracticable of men. Niebuhr's reputation and knowledge eminently qualified him for the mission to Holland; but Napoleon himself instructed his brother, King Louis, to prevent the success of the negotiator. The only result of the journey is to be found in the valuable letters on Holland, which are published in the collection of Niebuhr's *Minor Works*.

The emperor refused to discuss the amount of the contributions with Prince William, and set out on a triumphal progress to Italy. Daru treated Sack with so little consideration, that Stein determined himself to undertake the negotiation at Berlin. The heavy wits of the Prussian capital declared that the two stones, *Stein* and *Pierre Daru*, would only strike fire when they came into contact. Nor did it seem improbable that the

proud and irritable Minister would be brought into dangerous collision with the susceptibility and insolence of the conquering nation. But there is no species of business for which a strong character is unfitted. Stein knew both himself and the object which he had determined to attain. After condescending to flatter Daru by procuring his election to the Berlin Academy, he succeeded before the end of March in obtaining his signature to a convention, by which, subject to the Emperor's approval, the terms of payment, and the periods of evacuation, were finally arranged. Immediately afterwards, at the urgent request of the Queen and the Royal Family, the Minister returned to Königsberg for the purpose of overawing the hostile cabals which had been formed in his absence.

In the meantime, the hopes which the Spanish insurrection had spread throughout Europe were not unfelt in Prussia. The Military Commission had already commenced its salutary labours. In the closest union with Stein, Scharnhorst determined on training the whole population to arms by composing the limited force tolerated by the conqueror's jealousy of a rapid succession of young recruits, who, after completing their term of service, formed a reserve in the ranks of the *landwehr*. It appears from some reminiscences of the minister Schön, published in the Appendix to Pertz's third volume, that Scharnhorst regarded the *landwehr* only as a reserve. 'He was an excellent soldier of the line,' says Schön, who attributes to Count Dohna the organisation of the national militia in 1813. Niebuhr wrote protests from Amsterdam against any attempt to raise an army, or any thought of a second struggle from France. Phocion had, he said, prudently warned the Athenians to submit to Philip; and Jeremiah had given admirable advice to the rebellious few who doubted the divine mission of Nebuchadnezzar, and courted the aid of Egypt. Stein, however, was not a man to listen to patriots or to prophets who preached submission to the foreigner. By the summer of 1808, it was calculated that Prussia could once more bring 80,000 men into the field; and the Minister, with his military colleagues Scharnhorst and Gneisenau, held that the time for the struggle had already arrived. Austria was arming. The Spanish war was still unsuppressed. The eventual aid of England was certain; although Canning intimated to Stein's agents that his Government would not be responsible for the consequences of a premature collision. Subsequent events may seem to have proved the inexpediency of an early struggle: but the advocates of war in 1808 had strong reasons to urge in support of their policy. It was more desirable to fight before the contributions were paid, than to

furnish the means of war to the enemy. Napoleon's unrelenting animosity to the State which he had so deeply humbled gave colour to the suspicion that his generals might be instructed to imitate at Königsberg the treacherous arrests of Bayonne. Above all, it was of vital importance to act in concert with Austria. The nearly balanced campaign of Aspern and Wagram might have had an opposite result, if Blücher and Scharnhorst had joined the Archduke Charles, or directed their forces against the enemy's communications.

The King was altogether disinclined to the projects and sanguine hopes of his Minister and of his generals. He had learned in 1806 to distrust his army and people; but even the experience of Tilsit had not shaken his reliance on Russia. Alexander, still hoping to obtain the Danubian Principalities through the favour of Napoleon, and anxious to secure the fruits of his perfidy in Finland, earnestly warned Frederic William, both by letter and in person, against any approximation to Austria. It was in vain that Stein reminded the King of Alexander's unsteady character, and of the superior military resources which Austria had developed in the recent wars. An early decision was necessary; for Napoleon had again increased his pecuniary demands, and he required that the Prussian army should be reduced to 30,000 men. Stein's hold on the royal confidence was already in some degree shaken, and his ministerial career was rapidly drawing to a close.

The changes which he had originated naturally caused dissatisfaction in many quarters; and his enemies were anxious at the same time to effect his overthrow, and to earn the favour of the French authorities at Berlin. While the rest of the nation was unanimous in resenting foreign oppression, all historical precedent would have been violated, if the invader had failed to find partisans and admirers in the court and aristocracy. Zastrow, Kalkreuth, Voss, and Prince Hatzfeldt were the most conspicuous members of the French faction; and there was little difficulty in supplying Soult or Davoust with indications of Stein's hostile dispositions. The communications which passed between Berlin and St. Petersburg in the early part of 1854 show that similar treachery is still not obsolete at the Prussian Court. The Minister had positively refused to connect himself with the secret society of the *Tugendbund*, although his name has been popularly connected with its establishment; but he had undoubtedly conceived the plan of a national insurrection in the event of a war of liberation. In consequence of information furnished to Soult, an agent from Königsberg was arrested and searched; and in August the result appeared in

the publication in the '*Moniteur*' of a letter from Stein to Prince Wittgenstein, containing allusions to Spain and to Austria, to the general discontent of Germany, and to the possibility of future resistance. The official journal humorously added, that M. de Champagny and Prince William had that day signed a treaty which removed all causes of quarrel between France and Prussia.

It was at once evident to Stein that his position was no longer tenable. The French Emperor would even have had reasonable cause for remonstrance, if he had obtained possession of the letter in a more regular manner. It was idle to suppose that the imperious master who had required the dismissal of Hardenberg, would tolerate a far more vigorous and determined opponent. In the first instance, the King refused to accept the resignation which his Minister instantly tendered. Two or three months were spent in completing, as far as possible, the reforms which had occupied his administration. In November he finally resigned his office, and proceeded to Berlin. At the beginning of January, 1809, the whole of Germany was astonished by an Imperial decree published in the '*Moniteur*,' with the date of Madrid. Napoleon's abnormal career scarcely presents a second instance of so ostentatious a defiance of all the rules of justice and international law. 'One Stein,' so ran the decree, '*Le nommé Stein*, seeking to excite troubles in Germany, is declared the enemy of France and of the Confederation of the Rhine. The property which the said Stein may possess, whether in France or in the territories of the Confederation, shall be sequestrated. The said Stein shall be arrested wherever he can be found by our troops or by those of our allies.' Six years later—and Stein, at the right hand of Alexander, was an active participator in the proclamation which declared the European outlawry of Napoleon.

Berlin with its French garrison was evidently a dangerous residence; but a rapid journey into Bohemia rescued Stein's person from arrest. His estates on the Rhine and in the Duchy of Warsaw were seized and kept in sequestration till the re-conquest of Germany. The Austrian Ministers dissuaded him from visiting Vienna, but they offered him an asylum at Troppau. At that city, at Brünn, and at Prague, he resided with his family for three years. The Emperor revenged himself for the escape of the victim by the arrest of his sister, the Baroness Marianne Stein, at her deanery of Wallerstein, on an absurd charge of treason. The innocent lady was compelled to travel as prisoner to Paris without a personal attendant, and for some time she was kept there in custody.

At the end of an illness produced by the alarm and hardships which she had suffered, the imperial vengeance was so far appeased that she was allowed to return to Germany.

Napoleon's extravagant act of tyranny pointed out to all German patriots their proper champion and leader. Mr. Pertz states that it was from the Madrid decree that Stein's name was first known to himself and to thousands of others. The enemy of the public oppressor became the representative of national feeling. Niebuhr was as usual almost frantic with grief, alarm, and disapprobation. He attributed the blow which had fallen to error and weakness on the part of his friend, and to influences which would have been counteracted by his own presence. Stein, however, was not like his critic one who thought all dangers inevitable, and all difficulties insurmountable. Niebuhr, though a true patriot, deprecated resistance to a foreign conqueror, as he uniformly resisted every scheme for extending constitutional freedom, notwithstanding his sincere theoretical attachment to liberty. It is singular that he was at last frightened by the Revolution of July into the illness of which he died. Notwithstanding his warnings, and the respectable authority of Jeremiah, Stein was already placing his hopes in the Pharaoh of Austria.

When the victory of Wagram and the conqueror's marriage with Maria Louisa had disappointed the hopes raised at Aspern, the ex-Minister's impatience of repose frequently betrayed itself in complaints of the approach of old age. He omitted no opportunity of attempting to influence public affairs. He drew up memorials on education for the Austrian Government, corresponded incessantly with Scharnhorst and his colleagues, and attempted, through the Prince Regent's Hanoverian Minister, Count Münster, to obtain some employment in the service of England. Three years after his retirement a new and unexpected field was opened for his energies.

In March, 1812, on the very eve of the war, in obedience to an invitation from Alexander, he joined the Imperial headquarters at Wilna. He judiciously declined the offer of a post in the Russian service, preferring to act as adviser to the Emperor on all questions relating to German affairs. His position was in many respects anomalous; but it was understood on all sides that the ex-Minister of Prussia owed no general allegiance to the sovereign whom he undertook to aid in a war in which Russia was nominally an enemy. For Stein's vigorous understanding and manly conscience it was enough to know that for the time the hopes of Germany were bound up in the success of Russia. He could best serve his

country by influencing the policy of the only independent sovereign who still existed on the Continent. The Emperor was accustomed to foreign counsellors. At different periods of his reign he reposed confidence in Czartoriski, in the Corsican ex-member of the Constituent Assembly Pozzo di Borgo, and in the Corfiote Greek Capo d'Istrias. Stein might well appear at his court as the virtual representative of a nation which, notwithstanding the adherence of its princes to France, was the natural confederate of any Power in arms against Napoleon.

By his advice the Emperor appointed a German Committee, under the presidency, first of the Duke of Oldenburg, and afterwards of Stein himself. An agency was maintained for a time at Prague for the purpose of circulating patriotic publications, and of enlisting bands of partisans who might intercept the French couriers, and eventually form the nucleus of a German insurrection. Through Gneisenau and Münster, Stein endeavoured to prepare the English Government for an expedition to the coast of the North Sea. It was also determined to form a German legion of deserters, prisoners, and volunteers. The most important result, however, of Stein's activity consisted in the conviction which he impressed on Alexander's mind that the liberation of Germany was an indispensable condition of a successful resistance to France. He accompanied the Emperor to Moscow, and afterwards to St. Petersburg, where he used all his influence to counteract the exertions of the peace party, headed by the Empress Mother and the Grand Duke Constantine. In October the commencement of the French retreat put an end to all proposals of submission. Stein was dining at the imperial table when the news arrived, and heard the remark of the Empress Mother that she would be ashamed of her German birth if a single Frenchman lived to cross the Rhine. Stein instantly sprang from his seat, white, as it is recorded, with rage, and replied, in language seldom heard at Court: 'Your Majesty is wrong in saying so, and especially in the presence of Russians who owe so much to the Germans. You ought to speak only of your cousins the German Princes. I lived on the Rhine in 1792 and the following years. There was no fault in the honest German nation. If the Princes had trusted them, and known how to use them, no Frenchman would ever have crossed the Elbe, not to speak of the Vistula and the Dnieper.' It must be remembered that the Empress Maria was a Princess of Wurtemberg; her brother was one of the most servile followers of Napoleon, from whom he had accepted the kingly title; her niece had married Jerome Bonaparte.

It does not, however, appear that Stein lost his influence at Court by a boldness which can scarcely have been consistent with imperial etiquette.

He has been censured for his share in introducing Russian influence into Germany; but Mr. Pertz has clearly shown that Stein was one of the first to guard against the danger which has since become so formidable. While Napoleon was still in Moscow he urged upon Münster, and on Pozzo di Borgo, the importance of inducing England to assume the lead in German affairs, which must otherwise fall to Russia. After the commencement of the retreat he used every exertion to induce the English Government to take the German Legion into its pay, and to commence operations between the Elbe and the Rhine. In a memoir which he forwarded from St. Petersburg, by the hands of Lord Walpole, he recommended the division of Germany between Austria and Prussia, adding the singular suggestion that at the approaching settlement of Europe, Holland should be added to the dominions of the English Crown. Earlier, perhaps, than any other statesman, he saw the necessity of guarding against the measure which has since unsettled the balance of power, and destroyed the independence of Germany. The problem which was eventually solved at the Congress of Vienna, was proposed from the time when Kutusoff commenced his westward march. Under the influence of Czartoriski, and other Polish advisers, Alexander was already meditating the reestablishment of Poland under himself, as constitutional king. The scheme was at the same time consistent with the hereditary policy of his house, and congenial to his personal inclinations. Peter the Great is said to have advised his descendants, after partitioning Poland, to resume by degrees the portions which might have been seized by their confederates. The greater part of Frederick's share of Poland had already been severed from Prussia, and it was possible that in the course of events Austria might be induced or compelled to abandon Galicia. Alexander himself, also, in the plenitude of absolute power, longed for the new excitement of constitutional administration. The dreamy love of freedom which he had imbibed in his youth was not yet exchanged for the kindred religious mysticism which characterised his later years. He gravely assured Stein that the propagation of liberal principles was the only object for which he wished to live. Although the Emperor's liberalism led to the acquisition of Poland, as his piety afterwards embodied itself in the Holy Alliance, there is no reason to suppose that his sentiments in either case were exclusively or consciously hypocritical.

From the first Stein clearly saw that no Polish Constitution would offer a barrier against Russian ambition. He explained to Münster the manner in which the projected kingdom would overlap Hungary, and penetrate into the heart of Germany. The danger, he said, could only be obviated by the union of England and Austria, who might put a stop to these wild plans by distinct and firm declarations. The English Government can scarcely be blamed for the coldness with which these appeals were received. The Peninsular campaigns demanded all the military resources of the nation. The disgraceful campaign of Jena had destroyed all confidence in the armies of Northern Germany; nor was it unreasonable to suspect that Russia might again revert to the French alliance, after the treachery and rapacity which had been displayed at Tilsit. A bolder Minister than Lord Liverpool might well shrink from a proposal to revive the scheme for the union of Holland with England, which had been dropped since the days of Cromwell. About the same time the English Cabinet became aware of a still wilder project, drawn up by Count Münster, and communicated by order of the Prince Regent to the Courts of Russia and Sweden. The cool and experienced Hanoverian statesman was still a German. He reminded the Regent that the House of Welf, the oldest in the world, had, in the person of Henry the Lion, only six or seven centuries before, been deprived of vast dominions by an act of injustice, which there was now an opportunity to repair. He accordingly proposed that the Netherlands, with Hanover, Westphalia, and the neighbouring provinces should be constituted into a kingdom, which would pass to the male heir on the accession of the Princess Charlotte to the English throne. About the same time Gneisenau recommended that England should incorporate with her own dominions the whole of the Netherlands, and all the conquests which her arms could effect in Northern Germany.

Stein, with more practical sagacity, placed his hopes in the regeneration of Prussia; and it was in a great measure owing to his influence that Alexander, after the destruction of the French army, formed the resolution of reestablishing the monarchy of Frederick the Great. A strong party in Russia considered that the objects of the war were accomplished by the evacuation of the national territory. The Chancellor Romanzow, Stein's old Mayence opponent, had at all times deprecated opposition to France; and many of the generals, including the aged Commander-in-chief, were unwilling to risk in an offensive war the reputation which they had earned. The main army was reduced to 27,000 men on its arrival at Wilna. Finally,

there was reason to fear that the Emperor might concentrate his efforts on the immediate accomplishment of his Polish projects. In an elaborate memorial Stein proposed to Alexander the adoption of the policy which was subsequently carried out. He recommended that the King of Prussia should be invited to enter into an alliance with Russia; but that all engagements with the minor German Princes should be avoided. The allied Sovereigns were to appoint Commissioners to administer the districts evacuated by the enemy, leaving the permanent condition of Germany to be settled at the peace. With singular and characteristic boldness Stein, at the same time, recommended the dismissal of Romanzow, describing him as 'false and fantastical; crammed with pointless anecdotes, which proceed 'from the withered head of a courtier.' Instead of expressing resentment, Alexander took the advice of his foreign counsellor, and even consulted him on the choice of a successor.

The Emperor's formal declaration, that he would restore Prussia to the rank of a first-rate Power, produced its first result in the defection from Macdonald's army of Yorck with the Prussian contingent. In the first instance the King thought it prudent to disavow his general, and even to offer a renewal of his alliance with Napoleon; nor was it until his arrival at Breslau that Scharnhorst succeeded in convincing him that the nation was able and resolved to throw off the foreign yoke. At a much later period Frederick William left on record his gratitude to the officer who had, on his own responsibility, broken off the French alliance. The negotiations with Yorck were already in a forward state, when the Emperor left St. Petersburg, in December, to place himself at the head of the army. Stein followed him in a few days, after writing urgently to his friends to take advantage of the new prospects which had opened for Europe: he told Münster that England was too late to assume the conduct of the war; but that men and arms ought to be sent without delay. With his usual freedom in personal criticism, he complained that Lord Cathcart was utterly incompetent; and he urged the importance of sending an abler representative to the headquarters of the allies. To Walmoden he said, 'Tettenborn and Winzingerode are covering themselves with glory, and you, better than both, are going about Europe as a traveller.' To Gneisenau his exhortations were still more pressing. 'I earnestly beg you,' he said, 'to come. What are you doing in England, while Russians and Frenchmen are fighting in all directions in Germany? I earnestly entreat you to come. Farewell; but come.' The gallant soldier, who had never desponded in the worst of times, was

soon to have the reward of his perseverance, and the opportunity of justifying the confidence of his friend. Second chief of the staff at Gross-Görschen and at Bautzen, and from the death of Scharnhorst principal guide and adviser of Blücher, Gneisenau shared the glory of his chief at the Katzbach, and at Leipsic. During the latter part of the advance on Paris he virtually commanded the army; nor was he absent from the side of the daring old Marshal in the concluding struggles of Ligny and Waterloo. Stein was perhaps not aware that Gneisenau arrived in Prussia with a commission to take the garrison of Colberg into English pay, if he found the King still allied to the enemy.

When the left wing of the French had been uncovered by the defection of Yorck, the generals of the Russian forces, who first crossed the frontier of East Prussia, were disposed to treat it as a conquered province. The relations of the local authorities, and of Yorck himself, with the commanders of the invading army were in the highest degree unsatisfactory. The President von Schön steadily refused his aid in appropriating the resources of his district to a cause which his Government might disapprove; and there was reason to fear that an honourable and patriotic feeling would seriously impede the liberation of the country from a foreign yoke. Alexander fortunately possessed in Stein the fittest of all agents for putting an end to the difficulty. Armed with full power from the Czar, the ex-Minister of Prussia arrived at Königsberg with the determination that the province should adhere to the common cause. After persuading the Emperor to recall his Corsican general Paulucci, the plenipotentiary directed that a meeting of the Estates should be summoned to vote supplies for the army. Schön, notwithstanding their old friendship, protested against the interference of a Russian commissioner; but in substance he acquiesced in the course which was suggested. After some violence of altercation with the President and with Yorck, Stein consented to leave Königsberg before the meeting of the Diet. Yorck obtained from the Estates a grant of money, and authority to call out the *landsturm* and *landwehr* for the defence of the province. Schön did justice to the patriotic self-denial of his friend, and naturally prided himself on the success with which he had defended the rights of his sovereign. The Russian plenipotentiary might with more justice have boasted that the object of his mission had been fully obtained, although he had required the smallest possible sacrifice of national dignity and constitutional propriety. It was no part of his intention to make the freedom of Europe depend on the caprice of the Court of Berlin. Without the consent of the Crown the

resources of the province had been in the most decorous manner devoted to the purposes of the war in anticipation of the formal alliance. If any additional irregularity had been indispensable to the attainment of the main object, Schön's scruples would have been more rudely treated.

The formal agreement between the two Governments could not be much longer delayed. By a strange fortune, Stein himself appeared at Breslau as the representative of Alexander, to obtain from his own sovereign the signature of the treaty of alliance. The Emperor undertook to restore to Prussia the limits of 1806, substituting, however, the Kingdom of Saxony for the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, which was already occupied as a conquered territory by the Russian army. Seeing the fixed resolution of Alexander, Stein thought that acquiescence in his Polish policy was unavoidable, and that the question could at the best only be left open till the final settlement of Europe. Through the negligence of Hardenberg, the compact was afterwards fulfilled in favour of the stronger Power, although England and Austria succeeded in preventing the total incorporation of Saxony with Prussia. When Princess Louisa Radziwill applied to Stein to exercise his influence in favour of the independence of Poland, he was obliged to answer that his own functions were strictly confined to the affairs of Germany. He could only refer the Princess to Prince Czartoriski, the principal author of the plan which Alexander had adopted, and his confidential adviser on all questions relating to Poland.

The destruction of the Grand Army had led the Allies to underestimate the resources of their great antagonist. When only 40,000 Russians had crossed the Oder, and the Prussian levies were still incomplete, Napoleon resumed his wonted superiority at Gross Görschen and Bautzen. The princes of Western Germany ordered Te Deums to be sung for the triumph of order and legitimacy. The King of Wurtemberg decreed that criminals hostile to the French domination should be denied the aid of advocates on their trials. The King of Saxony obeyed the summons of the conqueror. Bavaria was enthusiastic in defence of her redoubted protector. Princes and statesmen often add to the vulgar reverence for power a professional enthusiasm which expressed itself forty years since in the language which has more recently been principally applied to the Emperor Nicholas. Then, as in our own time, the defence of ancient charters and franchises was called revolution, and order throughout the continent was synonymous with usurpation and tyranny. The 'Moniteur,' after the battle of Bautzen, denounced as a mischievous demagogue the proud

aristocrat who had proved himself so formidable an enemy. 'The notorious Stein,' according to the official organ, 'was an object of contempt to all honest men. It was his desire to raise the rabble against the owners of property.' The peaceable population were congratulated on their escape from 'Stein and the Cossacks.' But it is unnecessary to quote at length the stereotyped jargon of despots and their sycophants. Honester critics were about the same time attacking the alleged revolutionist for a supposed want of zeal in the cause of Germany. Niebuhr, whom he had invited to share in his official labours, could not understand that the adviser of the Czar would lose all his influence if he adopted an exclusively Prussian tone. After two or three months of mutual jarring and irritation, Niebuhr threw up his appointment; and it was only many years later that their friendship was revived at Rome.

After the termination of the armistice, and the adhesion of Austria to the League, a great change took place in the policy of the war. Entering without enthusiasm into a contest which had long been foreseen, Metternich desired solely to recover the lost dominions of Austria, and to secure a durable peace. The avowed determination of his sovereign not to reassume the Crown of the Roman Empire, implied the maintenance of the minor princes in the full sovereignty which they had acquired under the patronage of Napoleon. The revival of the old kingdom of Otho and Conrad had from the first been impracticable. The Austrian influence rendered the division of Germany between the two great monarchies an equally hopeless project. It was in vain that Stein denounced a cool and calculating policy which was supported by Lord Aberdeen and by Nesselrode. To Metternich he applied the well-known passage from Faust on the blindness of the cunning*; and of the young Russian Minister already advanced through family interest to the Cabinet, though ostensibly excluded from the confidence of his master, he spoke with unbounded contempt. His indignation, in this instance, seems to have affected the clearness of his judgment. He scarcely rendered justice to the foresight with which Metternich looked beyond the immediate struggle; and he undoubtedly overrated the simplicity of 'poor little Nesselrode,' when he regarded him as the victim of Austrian intrigues. The Court of Vienna already saw danger in the East,

* 'Ein Kerl der finassirt

Ist wie ein Thier auf dürrer Heide

Von einem bösen Geist in Kreis herumgeführt,

Und rings umher liegt schöne grüne Weide.'

and remembered that within the year the Russian frontier had been advanced from the Dnieper to the Pruth. The designs of the Czar on Moldavia and Wallachia had never been concealed; nor could the purpose indicated by the occupation of Warsaw be mistaken. The fear of a new disturbance of the balance of power suggested the possibility that Napoleon might be advantageously maintained in possession of the left bank of the Rhine as a counterpoise to a rival conqueror. This jealousy of Russian aggrandizement, which forms the key to the subsequent policy of Metternich, provoked the bitterest resentment on Alexander's part. For considerable periods he refused to transact business with a statesman whom he with reason considered, to the end of his life, his most implacable opponent: but a Russian emperor is always cautious in his most impetuous moments. It is highly probable that 'honest little Nesselrode' acted under private instructions when he acquiesced in the Austrian policy. Both the allied Emperors were in the habit of disclaiming the obnoxious acts of their servants. Francis II., a more homely and successful hypocrite than his confederate, invariably expressed his concurrence in the charges which Alexander preferred against Metternich; nor is it unreasonable to assume that the Czar may have caused one of his numerous ministers to act the part of a dupe in the presence of his skilful adversary. The defect of the farsighted Austrian policy consisted in the impossibility of conducting a war against such an enemy as Napoleon in a half-hearted and temporising spirit. The victory of confederated Europe was secured, not by the combinations of Metternich, but by the ambition of Alexander, by the patriotic enthusiasm which armed 250,000 men out of the Prussian population of 5,000,000, and by the vast resources of England. The Austrian Government, which controlled the diplomacy of the Allies, and named the generalissimo of the combined forces, never sent 50,000 men at one time into the field.

Immediately after the battle of Leipsic the allies conferred on Stein an extraordinary mark of confidence, by vesting in his hands the supreme administration of all conquered territories. The whole of Germany, with the exception of the Austrian and Prussian States, of Hanover, Bavaria, and Wurtemberg, was divided into districts under governors-general. The control of the entire system, with the appointment of governors, and of other high functionaries, was entrusted to Stein. It was the duty of the Central Administration to provide for the wants of the army in each province, to draw out its resources in men and money for the aid of the common cause, and to superintend the management of the military hospitals. At one period Stein's

powers extended over a population of thirteen millions in Germany; and after the advance of the allies into France he exercised similar functions in the departments occupied by their army. The troops furnished by the Central Administration were estimated at 160,000. It is scarcely surprising that about this time some enthusiastic Prussian officers took a legal opinion on the eligibility of Stein to the vacant rank of German King and Emperor.

It was afterwards thought that Metternich had forwarded the arrangement for the purpose of removing from the immediate vicinity of Alexander's person an able and determined opponent. It is certain that while Stein was employed at Leipsic in organising his administrative system, the Austrian minister, with the consent of the allies assembled at Frankfort, offered peace to the enemy on the terms that France should retain her conquests as far as the Alps and the Rhine. Soon after Stein's arrival at headquarters he succeeded in persuading Alexander to carry on the war during the continuance of the negotiations, but he failed to secure the adoption of Blücher's plan for a rapid march on Paris. Metternich wished to maintain his communications with Italy, and to give Napoleon time for concession. The assembled diplomatists were still influenced by the terror which the French victories had for twenty years spread over Europe. While their formidable enemy was straining all his resources to make a final effort, the allies ostentatiously and gratuitously paraded their solicitude for the honour of France, and absurdly disclaimed the wish of rescuing even those provinces which had within the memory of the existing generation been forcibly severed from Germany. A display of force and a resolution to use it, forms the indispensable basis of negotiation between belligerents. Napoleon reasonably assumed that professions of generosity on the part of his adversaries were either indications of complicity or confessions of weakness. Metternich and his coadjutors unintentionally overreached the enemy whom they wished to save from the consequence of his own presumption. The cause which Stein and Blücher had at heart was most effectually served by the rejection of their counsels. An early advance would probably have secured the acceptance of the offers which were blindly rejected at Chaillon. For a considerable period, however, the peace-party was all powerful. Hardenberg, as well as Nesselrode, adhered to the Austrian policy, and Castlereagh on his arrival at headquarters supported with greater authority the cause which Lord Aberdeen had zealously promoted. Count Münster, on the other hand, advocated the vigorous prosecution of hostilities;

and in a singular correspondence, carried on through Count Lieven and Stein*, the Prince Regent and Lord Liverpool expressed a wish for the overthrow of the Emperor and for the restoration of the Bourbons. Alexander, probably misunderstanding the relations between the English sovereign and his minister, ventured to reproach Lord Castlereagh with his abject devotion to the policy of Metternich; but the Foreign Secretary knew his position and maintained his dignity. The greater ability and knowledge of Münster, although he possessed the personal confidence of the Regent, were insufficient to place the Minister of Hanover in a position to resist the Minister of England. At the end of February Castlereagh overruled Alexander's objection to an armistice, and of all the Russian counsellors only Stein and Pozzo di Borgo ventured to oppose the project of a peace. Three weeks later Napoleon refused the conditions of the allies, and commenced the daring and brilliant campaign on which his last hopes reposed. The inequality of force was too great, and notwithstanding the heavy blows which he had received, and the slackness of the Austrian generalissimo, Blücher pressed forward to Paris. In the prospect of an immediate change in the government of France, Stein used his utmost influence to counteract Alexander's half-formed scheme for transferring the Imperial Crown to the King of Rome, under the regency of Bernadotte. Two days before the capture of Paris, Stein himself adopted the bold measure of ordering his subordinate at Dijon to receive the Count d'Artois. Before his own arrival in the capital the allied sovereigns had already proclaimed the restoration of the Bourbons. On the 10th of April he wrote from Paris to congratulate his wife on the fall of the enemy, whom he by no means affected to pity or forgive. 'The Archduchess,' he concluded, 'returns to her father. Jerome is gone to Stuttgart, Joseph to Switzerland, and so all this vagabond rabble is crushed' (*so ist alles dieses lumpengesindel zu boden*).

The triumphant termination of the war, changing the policy of the Allied Powers, incidentally affected Stein's position. His influence in the councils of the Czar had represented the alliance which circumstances had established between the in-

* Count Lieven's despatch is published in the collection of Lord Castlereagh's Letters and Despatches. Lord Liverpool afterwards gave his colleague an explanation which he accepted as satisfactory. Stein was not aware that the English Government had from the first felt a strong repugnance to Alexander's policy, and a suspicion of his relations with Bernadotte.

terests of Russia and those of Germany. He had neither the power nor the wish to support Alexander in the projects of amateur liberalism and territorial aggrandizement which henceforth occupied his imagination. Metternich's disposition to spare the susceptibility of France had subsided with the fall of Napoleon; but Lord Castlereagh was consistent in his efforts to moderate the demands of the conquerors; and the Russian Emperor amused himself by co-operating, through the agency of Nesselrode, in the construction of a constitutional system for France. The approaching divergence in the views of the confederates was so evident to the assembled sovereigns, that they willingly adjourned the more delicate questions which were likely to arise. Austria entered into private arrangements with Bavaria for the settlement of Southern Germany. Alexander was not anxious to anticipate an investigation into his title to the Polish territories, which his armies continued to occupy. Hanover, supported by England, was secured against the claims of stronger Powers. The position of Prussia alone was uncertain. It was only in the Kingdom of Saxony that a vacant territory could be found as a compensation for the Grand Duchy of Warsaw; but it was easy to foresee that Austria would discountenance the claim, and that Russia might be careless to enforce it. Stein, who still administered Saxony through the governor-general, Prince Replin, urged upon Hardenberg the importance of settling the territorial question while the brilliant services of Blücher and of the Prussian army were still fresh in the minds of the allies. The indolence and carelessness of the Chancellor of State threw away an opportunity which could never afterwards be recovered. By a secret article of the Treaty of Paris it was agreed that the questions of Poland and Saxony should be reserved for the decision of the Four Powers at Vienna. The allied sovereigns, with their principal ministers, were in haste to enjoy the hospitalities of the Prince Regent, and the solution of all political difficulties was adjourned to the approaching Congress.

Stein spent the summer at Frankfort and at Nassau, and in September, by Alexander's express invitation, he arrived at Vienna in readiness for the opening of the Congress. No statesman, in all that vast assembly of diplomatists, was more capable of giving a sound judgment on the two great questions which absorbed its attention. More solicitous than Hardenberg himself for the restoration of Prussia to her former rank in Europe, he was at the same time anxious to establish a constitutional system, by which German unity might be secured. His position, however, was essentially false. While Castle-

reagh and Hardenberg, Metternich and Alexander, spoke in the name of the Powers that governed the world; Stein could rely only on his own great name, and on the voluntary confidence which a foreign monarch might think fit to allow him. His indefinite position as a mediator between Germany and Russia, made him the centre of innumerable applications from Princes who wished for additional territory, and from patriots who desired security against petty despots. In his relations with the Emperor he could only depend on the respect which was inspired by his unbending character and by his well-known influence in Germany. On the other hand, Alexander was well aware that his uncompromising adviser despised his liberalism and distrusted his ambition. The versatile Russian distributed his confidence to several agents who were entrusted with different employments. Rasumoffsky was nominally his principal minister. Nesselrode, as Secretary of State, continued to support Metternich, who was in open hostility with his master. Capo d'Istria already began to prepare for the future independence of Greece. Czartoriski was charged with the maintenance of the Czar's favourite scheme for the revival of a constitutional monarchy in Poland. In Stein Alexander was certain of a wise and patriotic adviser on German affairs, and his connexion with the great patriot secured him from the suspicions of the nation which was primarily interested in separating Poland from Russia. With Rasumoffsky, Capo d'Istria, and Pozzo, now ambassador at Paris, Stein maintained the most cordial relations. He was on friendly terms with Hardenberg and with William von Humboldt. His Prussian inclinations separated him from the English envoys, as well as from Metternich and from Nesselrode. Well aware of the anomalous character and uncertainty of his position, he still took an active part in the Saxon negotiations, and assumed the lead in the discussions on the German Constitution.

The deliberations of the Congress had scarcely commenced, when the inevitable conflict of opposite interests began to make itself felt. During the earlier debates on the Polish question, Alexander found himself entirely unsupported. Among his own advisers, Rasumoffsky, Pozzo, and Capo d'Istria dissuaded him from the project of placing a constitutional Poland by the side of the absolutism which must be maintained in Russia. Hardenberg concurred with Metternich in protesting against the aggressive military position which the Grand Duchy of Warsaw would afford, and recalled to the Emperor's recollection the promises which he had made at the commencement of the league of 1813. The Poles, however, with Czartoriski

at their head, demanded the restitution of their national existence; and Alexander declared that it was his duty to repair the crimes of his grandmother, the Empress Catherine. Lord Castlereagh bore the brunt of the opposition. In a memorandum addressed to the Emperor, he offered to satisfy his conscientious scruples by inducing Austria and Prussia to concur in the restoration of an independent kingdom of Poland. It was well known that Metternich would have given up Galicia for the purpose, and if the conclusions of diplomacy were dictated by logic, the English proposal would have been decisive. The English Minister, however, scarcely pretended to rely on his dialectic triumph. In substance he recommended a third partition of Poland, in which the Vistula should form the boundary of the Russian province. He was unfortunately enabled to enforce his arguments by references to the active share which England had taken in the appropriation of Finland at the expense of Sweden, and in the cession of Bessarabia by the Turks.

Stein had previously warned Alexander of the just alarm which his projects excited, and had advised Hardenberg rather to press for a limitation of the Russian territories than for the withdrawal of the Emperor's favourite plan of a representative government. Capo d'Istrias and Pozzo, with a more exclusive regard to the interests of the Imperial policy, earnestly remonstrated against the constitutional experiment, and pointed out the inexpediency of forcing on the attention of foreign Powers the internal system which might be established in Poland. Alexander, however, was not to be moved by argument or by opposition. The liberal professions which alarmed his allies were necessary to the satisfaction of his conscience. The extension of his empire would have caused him little pleasure unless his ambition could have assumed in his own eyes the form of generosity. Even in a pompous and feeble answer to Lord Castlereagh's Memorandum, he thought fit to assert that his own motives in securing the conquest of Finland had been less selfish than the interests which had led England to concur in the usurpation. 'Pour moi j'étais parti d'un principe plus *'généreux.'* Stein added, in a marginal note, *'et d'un principe de prudence.'* The correspondence closed with a note in which the English Minister declined to take into consideration either the personal disinterestedness of which the Emperor boasted, or the change of circumstances on which he relied, as an excuse for violating his formal engagements with the Allies. During a visit of the three sovereigns about this time to Pesth, Alexander was so imprudent as to allow his followers to sound

the Hungarians as to their disposition to transfer their allegiance to Russia. There can be little doubt that his Imperial host, one of the great masters of the modern spy-system, was fully informed of the advantage which had been taken of his hospitality. Displays of irritation against the statesmen who opposed the Russian policy were less calculated to excite uneasiness. Metternich and Castlereagh might well smile at the ill-bred vanity of the mushroom soldier who avowed in the drawing rooms of Vienna his contempt for every man who did not wear a uniform. It was in the course, however, of the Hungarian journey that Alexander achieved the decisive diplomatic triumph of detaching Prussia from the common cause of Europe. The personal ascendancy which the House of Romanoff has established over the House of Hohenzollern was exerted with so much effect that Frederick William formally ordered his minister to withdraw his opposition to the Polish claims of Russia. The arguments which effected the conversion may partly be collected from a subsequent statement of the Emperor in conversation with Hardenberg that the Austrian Minister had offered to recognise the kingdom of Poland on condition that Russia would oppose the Prussian claim to the Saxon territory. Metternich, in a formal note to the Chancellor of State, declared that the Imperial assertion was false; nor does Alexander's expression of regret that he could not resent the contradiction by a challenge, prove the truth of an allegation in itself highly improbable. The hope of Metternich to preserve the kingdom of Saxony depended in some measure on the possibility of compensating Prussia by the concession of the Polish territories on the left bank of the Vistula. The habitual antagonism of Austria to her German rival was for the moment a far less pressing interest than the opposition provoked by Russian encroachment.

There can be little doubt that in return for the great concession made by Frederick William, Alexander undertook to guarantee the incorporation of the Saxon dominions with Prussia. At the commencement of the Congress, the object which Hardenberg had failed to secure at Paris seemed to be still attainable. England was neutral or favourable; Russia advocated the claim; the opposition of Austria was indirect and doubtful; and the protests of Talleyrand were rejected by the conquering Powers. The press of Berlin teemed with demonstrations of the injury which would be inflicted on the Saxon people by dismemberment; and, as it was agreed on all sides that a part of the kingdom must be assigned to the conqueror, there were plausible reasons for adding the remainder. It was

a case like that of Solomon's judgment, with the addition that the spurious mother was in any event entitled to half the body of the child. Niebuhr, Eichhorn, and Varnhagen were among the ablest literary advocates of Prussia. Stein was able to take a practical step to enforce the claims of his former Sovereign by persuading the allied Sovereigns to transfer the provisional government of Saxony to the Prussian authorities. His last act as head of the Central Administration of the conquered provinces, consisted in the recall of the Saxon Governor-general, Prince Repnin. The King imprudently rejected Stein's suggestion that he should conciliate popular favour by appointing his brother, Prince William, as his representative at Dresden.

If the Prussian acquiescence in the Russian project was purchased by the hope of ruining Saxony, the bargain proved unprofitable. The allies, when they found resistance to Russia on the main question of dispute to be hopeless, were little inclined to give way to her on secondary points, or to strengthen her close confederate. England and Austria began for the first time to show, by admitting Talleyrand to their councils, that they might be tempted to raise up France as a counterpoise to Russia.* The Polish dispute was still open in form, though practically settled; and just indignation was excited by demonstrations at Warsaw in favour of the imperial pretensions, under the immediate influence of the Grand Duke Constantine. The appropriation of Saxony by Prussia was unpopular in England; and Münster, who had recently of his own accord assumed the kingly title for his Sovereign, found Castlereagh willing to aid his resistance to the pretensions of a State which had often shown itself a dangerous neighbour to Hanover. Stein used all his influence in support of the claims put forward by Hardenberg and Humboldt; but he remonstrated against an instruction by which the Emperor directed his ambassador, Count Lieven, to intrigue with the English Opposition against Castlereagh's policy. 'The English Minister,' said Stein, 'is one of the most commonplace of men, ill-judged, ill-informed, and blindly led by Count Münster; but he is honestly forwarding, to the best of his ability, the interests of his country.' Except in extraordinary circumstances it is necessary to deal with a Government as the legitimate representative of the nation. In the case of Prussia, Alexander had succeeded in separating the Sovereign

* Lord Castlereagh had even in Paris concerted with Talleyrand an eventual alliance against Russia. It was not, however, until the desertion of the common cause by Prussia, that he finally determined to co-operate with France.

from the Minister; but all his efforts failed before the obstinacy of the Austrian Emperor. When Francis expressed his sympathy with the tirades of his ally against Metternich, he may have remembered, not without amusement, that Nesselrode still retained the post of Russian Secretary of State, notwithstanding his close connexion with the obnoxious Minister. 'Nesselrode has lost all his influence,' said Stein, at this time, 'through his incapacity, and his blind devotion to Metternich. . . . His mediocrity, ignorance, and narrowness of thought and feeling, as well as his want of spirit in difficult questions, prevented his ever long maintaining himself at a certain height.' Forty years have passed, and the old Chancellor of State still maintains the height from which he presides over Russian diplomacy. It is strange that Stein failed to perceive that the Sovereign whom he had served for three years required agents on both sides.

In the beginning of January, 1815, Castlereagh, Metternich, and Talleyrand signed the secret treaty for eventual resistance to Russia, which has since become so celebrated. It was agreed that each of the contracting Powers should furnish 150,000 men, if any one of their number was exposed to aggression in carrying out the decisions of the Congress. Bavaria, Hanover, and the Netherlands, were invited to join the alliance, and it was afterwards extended to Sardinia. It is remarkable that so important a secret was never betrayed during the subsequent negotiations. Napoleon, on his return to the Tuileries, found a copy of the treaty in the Foreign Office, and immediately forwarded it to Alexander; but in the meantime the danger of collision had passed over by the adoption of a system of compromises.* Castlereagh conciliated the Prussian Ministers by protesting against the demand of the King of Saxony to take a part in the negotiations. He also pointed out the inconvenience of a scheme which had been suggested for compensating the dispossessed monarch by a principality on the Rhine, where he would necessarily be dependent on French influence. Finally, he showed that all existing difficulties might be removed if Russia would accommodate her ally with some additional portions of the Duchy of Warsaw. Alexander had already consented to give over Thorn to Prussia, and to leave Cracow neutral, and nominally independent, as a security to Austria. All

* Alexander sent for Metternich, showed him the Treaty, and said that it should never be mentioned again. Nesselrode wrote to Castlereagh, '*C'est le cas pour nous tous de last shilling and last*

further concessions he positively refused; but he now began to hint that he might be found less obstinate in the Prussian cause than in his own. 'Hardenberg,' he said, 'had in the first instance joined the coalition against Russia; but still, if the King insisted on his full demands, he would not shrink from his engagements.' It was not difficult to understand that the weaker confederate must moderate his claims in deference to the opposition which had been called forth by the success of his more powerful supporter.

The Polish controversy ended with a memorandum from the English Minister. After expressing his regret that it had proved impossible to restore the independence of Poland, Lord Castlereagh expressed a hope that the three partitioning Powers would, by the encouragement of liberal institutions, and by a beneficent administration, give their Polish subjects as little reason as possible to regret their lost independence. It need scarcely be added that Russia, Austria, and Prussia were equally eager to give an undertaking which at the same time saved appearances and avoided inconvenient pledges. Of all those who had taken a part in the negotiation, Alexander alone could boast of success. He had pushed the advanced posts of his Empire into the heart of Europe, and with the sanction and applause of the Czartoriskis and the Radzivils, he had done much to complete the work of Catherine II. His opponents had been placed in the false position of opposing a scheme which purported to repair the greatest crime of the eighteenth century. Notwithstanding their verbal professions, Castlereagh and Metternich had necessarily advocated the entire dismemberment of the ancient kingdom. The Poles alone were consistent, and even prudent, in accepting the professions of Alexander. The imperial philanthropist, however shallow his liberalism might prove, offered them a national representation, and the more valuable boon of a national army. It was under the arrangements of 1815 that they were enabled to check the usurpations of Constantine, and in two campaigns to try the utmost strength of Russia; falling only after a struggle which must have been successful if Austria, or Prussia, or France had been true to the cause of Europe.

Before resigning his mission to the Duke of Wellington, Castlereagh succeeded in arranging the Saxon dispute. The king paid for his attachment to Napoleon with one half of his dominions, and the extension of the Prussian frontier to the Bohemian mountains was postponed for an indefinite period. The triple alliance of January proved to have been unnecessary, as the allied sovereigns had fortunately returned to more amicable

relations before the arrival of the startling news that the fallen Emperor was once more in France. The compensations and adjustments of territory among the minor States still remained to be settled. The affairs of Switzerland had been referred to a Committee under the presidency of Stein, including Humboldt, Dalberg, Stratford Canning, and Capo d'Istria. The result of their labours was embodied in a report, which, after receiving the sanction of the Congress, became the foundation of the federal constitution.

The organisation of the Germanic body had proceeded contemporaneously with the territorial settlement of Europe. Stein's attention to the question had dated from the commencement of the Russian war; and his wishes had uniformly pointed to the mediatization of the minor Princes, and to the division of the ancient kingdom between the two great monarchies of the north and the south. The treaty of Reichenbach, by which Austria adhered to the Alliance against Napoleon, leaving open to the Princes of Germany the opportunity of joining the league, secured their future existence. Bavaria by the treaty of Ried, and Wurtemberg by the treaty of Fulda, obtained a guarantee for their maintenance of the position which both kingdoms owed to the favour of Napoleon. After the battle of Leipsic all the little potentates of the Rhine hastened to profit by the liberal provisions of Reichenbach. It was, however, still open to the great Powers to subject them either to limitation of territory, or to constitutional restrictions. Metternich himself, although his jealousy of Prussia rendered him the champion and patron of the Princes, could not meditate the suicidal policy of leaving the members of the Rhenish confederation in possession of the prerogatives which they had employed to further the encroachments of France. As Francis II. had already declared his determination to refuse the imperial Crown, it became necessary to provide a substitute for the Empire. By the Treaty of Chaumont, on the 1st of March, 1814, the Allied Powers declared that Germany should be a Federal State. Ten days later Stein delivered a memorandum to the Emperor Alexander in which he succinctly summed up the principal conditions of an efficient federal constitution. A directory of the four principal German Powers, a common army and tribunal, the institution of a Representative Assembly in each separate State, and the withdrawal from the exclusively German States of the right of peace and war: such were the practical suggestions offered for carrying out the resolution of the allies. It is, however, scarcely surprising that in the decisive crisis of the war, the consideration of constitutional questions was postponed to a calmer moment.

Hardenberg, on his return from London in the ensuing summer, submitted to Stein a detailed plan for a federal constitution, which, on the whole, satisfied his judgment. After much deliberation, an amended project was adopted, in which the executive for internal affairs was composed of the seven principal Governments; while the political direction was divided between Austria and Prussia. The Diet, or Deliberative Assembly, consisted of the Princes and Estates of the ancient empire. The territory included in the Federation was to be bounded on the east by the Elbe and the Inn. Stein considered it advisable that the greater portion of the Austrian and Prussian Monarchies should remain nominally as well as practically independent. It was for the purpose of checking the tyranny of anti-national propensities in the minor princes that the new constitution was required. Accordingly, they were restricted from making war and peace except through the federal Power, while all internal wars were positively prohibited. Every separate State was required to establish or maintain a legislative assembly, with the power of granting supplies and superintending expenditure. The plan which was thus developed, after undergoing various mutilations, formed the basis of the present Federal Constitution. That it should have been adopted in its original form was highly improbable. Hanover alone, with England at her back, would not fail to reject some of the limitations which were placed on the independence of the minor governments. It was also easy to foresee that the objections of the minor States would in many instances be supported by Austria, while the influence of Russia, in this instance wielded by Stein, was an obvious anomaly which it would be indiscreet to put prominently forward.

The Congress entrusted the preparation of the constitutional project to the five principal German Powers. Bavaria and Wurtemberg from the first declared their intention of thwarting by all means at their command the introduction of a system which would limit their autocracy. Count Münster announced to the Committee that the Prince Regent, as a proof of his attachment to freedom, had already instructed the Duke of Cambridge to summon the Estates together. The dissensions which have since arisen in Hanover were for a time postponed; and the Assembly met under the most favourable auspices. About the same time, Gneisenau, to Münster's great regret, refused from the Regent the offer of the Viceroyalty. The German Committee proceeded slowly with its task. Stein opposed to the despotic resolution of the King of Wurtemberg the liberal inclinations and Russian connexions of his son the

Crown Prince, who has since become his successor. Against the influence of Bavaria he endeavoured to contend by urging Alexander not to consent that a province on the left bank of the Rhine should be awarded to the ancient satellite of France. His most anxious desire was, however, the restoration of the Imperial dignity. The numerous German Princes and States who were excluded from the Committee were almost unanimous in support of the demand. Capo d'Istrias, at Stein's request, obtained a favourable answer from Alexander, and Metternich for a time appeared to hesitate in his refusal. The opposition of Prussia, however, could not be surmounted. Humboldt gave a conclusive answer to the proposal, by showing that the Imperial Crown would be a mere fiction unless powers were conferred on Austria, which her great rival would never concede.

The details of the negotiations are fully and clearly recorded by M. Pertz; but it is unnecessary to go more fully into the particulars. The Committee was unable to accomplish its task; but the great Powers had determined on the constitution of a federal system; and after the recommencement of the French war, when the unity of Germany had become more than ever indispensable to their safety, they determined on the constitution which still exists. At the last moment, Metternich succeeded in reducing the article relating to representative government into a vague statement that a constitution of Estates should exist in the dominions of every member of the Confederacy. The imperfections of the compact which was finally adopted are to be attributed to the narrow policy of Austria, and to the selfishness of Bavaria and Wurtemberg. Prussia had throughout supported the introduction of an efficient system; and the smaller States, with scarcely an exception, were ready to make sacrifices for the restoration of a national unity in which they might have found security against their stronger neighbours. The assent of Hanover was combined with a vigorous protest against the imperfections of the compact, and with a declaration that the Prince Regent was induced to acquiesce by the consideration that the Federal Constitution at least offered no obstacle to the better government of his dominions.

Stein had left Vienna before the final adoption of the Federative Act; but he recorded his dissatisfaction in a memorandum which he presented to the Emperor Alexander. He had done his best to secure for his country the strength and unity which form the first conditions of independence. His memory has been attacked on the ground of his partiality to Prussia, and with more plausibility on account of his foreign connexion; but he had uniformly preferred the interests of Germany to the

favour of the Czar; and although he felt that the monarchy of Frederick the Great must be maintained and strengthened, he had not hesitated to urge the reassumption by Austria of the Imperial Crown. His political position was in a high degree embarrassing. The policy of Alexander was no longer consistent with his views; and the recent disputes had separated him from Hardenberg and from Humboldt. At the conclusion of the Congress he found himself on comparatively friendly terms with Metternich, and even listened to proposals for assuming the Presidency of the Diet as Austrian plenipotentiary.

In the second and final settlement of Europe Stein had little share. Nearly two months had passed after the battle of Waterloo before he joined the assembled statesmen at Paris. He found the policy and mutual relations of the Four Powers greatly changed, with the exception that England in 1815, as in the previous year, steadily advocated a moderate course towards the defeated party. The first restoration had been effected by Alexander, the second was exclusively the work of Wellington. The conquering generals who entered Paris were both great soldiers; but the English commander-in-chief, as a great statesman, at once took the control of affairs out of the inexperienced hands of Blücher. Both Alexander and Metternich complained that the Duke had been precipitate in occupying Paris, and argued that Louis XVIII. should only have been recalled after the provisional government had submitted to the necessary sacrifices. The Czar, however, though at this time unfriendly to England, substantially concurred in the policy of Castlereagh and Wellington. The worn-out excitement of dilettante liberalism had given way in his mind to the religious mysticism which he imbibed from Madame Krudener. Ambition, as usual, was found compatible with his sentimental impulses. His love for constitutional freedom had secured the kingdom of Poland; zeal for Christianity might not improbably facilitate the dismemberment of Turkey. Capo d'Istria, now his principal adviser, openly avowing himself a Greek in feeling rather than a Russian, was apparently indignant at the transfer of his native Ionian Islands to the English protectorate, and eager to find future support for the Hellenic cause.* It was easy to foresee that England and Austria would be jealous of Russian encroachments on Turkey; nor could the wildest imagination, in 1815, have anticipated Navarino. It seemed probable that France might aid

* Yet at Vienna Capo d'Istria told Lord Castlereagh that, as an Ionian, he should prefer the protectorate of England to that of Russia. (*Castlereagh's Letters and Despatches*.)

the designs of the Czar by keeping England in check, and the sagacity of the able Corfiote was fully justified by the events of 1828. Alexander, therefore, steadily opposed, not only the wild schemes of zealots for the disruption of France into provinces, but the more plausible demands of Prussia for the restoration of Alsace and of the eastern fortresses to Germany. Stein, after his arrival in Paris, cordially supported the arguments of Hardenberg and of Humboldt, who proved to demonstration that Mazarin and Louis XIV. had aggrandized their power by unjustifiable means, and that France, after all her losses, would still be too strong for her neighbours. Count Münster induced the Prince Regent to express a similar opinion, and to intimate his disapprobation of the policy adopted by his ministers. The Duke of Wellington, however, was not to be moved. He declared his concurrence in the opinion that France would be still too strong, but he was not prepared to inaugurate the European peace by sowing the seeds of future war. It was his wish that the Bourbon monarchy should command popularity and respect; nor would his opinion have varied if he had foreseen, with Capo d'Istria and Pozzo di Borgo, the advantage which a French alliance might hereafter afford to the progress of Russian ambition. On the whole, the Second Peace of Paris does credit to the statesmanlike wisdom of those who framed it. The victor of Waterloo was the object of bitter indignation among German patriots, and for a generation he furnished the favourite theme for the scurrility of French libellers. His calm and passionless appreciation of the real interests of Europe may now perhaps be better understood.

With the peace of 1815 Stein's official life came to an end. After staying a month in Paris he took leave of the Emperor and proceeded to Frankfort. Shortly afterwards he successively refused from Austria and Prussia the office of representing them in the Diet. Covered with decorations conferred by the allied sovereigns, universally respected and consulted by the supporters of German freedom, his latter years were spent in the pursuits of a wealthy country gentleman, strongly interested in public affairs, and actively engaged in the patronage of a great literary enterprise. In 1816 he exchanged his estate at Birnbaum for Cäppenberg in Westphalia, and for the remainder of his life he took a warm interest in the affairs of the province where he had spent the best years of his youth. The long delay in the fulfilment of the King's promise to give representative institutions to Prussia formed a constant source of annoyance to the retired statesman. A great part of his life was employed in projects for agitating the claims of the Westphalian Estates to the restoration of their ancient privileges. It must

be admitted, that during the continuance of the controversy Stein attached more and more weight to the aristocratic element in constitutional systems. There was no other existing legal right to set up against the despotism of kings and ministers; and although the Prussian police exhibited the meanness and folly of searching his letters for traces of connexion with demagogues, Stein was at no period of his life a revolutionary innovator. It is equally absurd and unjust to connect his name with the modern unpopular proceedings of the Junker party in Prussia and Hanover. The German aristocracy of the present day are opposed not to despotism but to popular influence. The courtiers of Berlin and Hanover would be the first to denounce an independent opposition, such as that which was carried on by Stein. His discontent with Hardenberg grew into open hostility as the minister became, with the advance of years, more indolent, reckless, and indifferent. In 1821 Niebuhr was gratified to find that his old chief, then on a visit to Rome, fully shared the antipathies which he had himself long entertained to the all-powerful Chancellor of State. In 1819, at the invitation of Alexander, Stein attended the Congress of Aix la Chapelle. In the same year he mourned over the death of Blücher, with the remark, 'The best thing one can do is to lie down on one side and die.' Soon afterwards he suffered a heavier loss in the death of his wife; and although he made no change in his active occupations, it was remarked that he was thenceforward more constantly impressed by deep religious feelings. About the same time he founded a society for the publication of the early German historians, and pursued the undertaking with his characteristic energy. After an interval he was fortunate enough to secure the services of M. Pertz, who, as editor of the '*Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*,' formed the acquaintance with Stein, to which we are indebted for the present admirable work. The concluding volumes of the work, which have just been published, contain a pleasing picture of the serene dignity and unaffected piety of the close of Stein's life; but the historical portion of the memoir necessarily concludes with the Minister's active public career. No statesman of the present age has been so fortunate in a biographer; and it may be added that the writer is happy in the selection of a hero whose fortunes placed him in the centre of great events, and whose character was always equal to circumstances. Stein died, full of years and honours, on the 29th of June, 1831. Which of the surviving or succeeding statesmen of Germany has emulated his illustrious career, or done as much for the greatness, liberty, and independence of his country?

ART. V.—*Lectures to Ladies on Practical Subjects.* Cambridge: 1855.

THESE Lectures, rough and unfinished as they are, and, in some instances, deficient in direct application to the auditory for whose benefit they were delivered, have a very clear general meaning. That meaning is so important and so characteristic of the times in which we live, that we are glad to express the hearty interest this volume has excited in our minds. It appears that, about a year ago, a college for working men was opened at No. 31. Red Lion Square, London, by a few residents in the neighbourhood. They who offered their services in organising the plan and in teaching, were ‘some of them lawyers, some medical men, some artists, some clergy-men.’ They opened evening classes for instruction in a variety of topics, the working man being free to choose his subject, and paying a small fee for his course. The scheme of the week’s work presented, first, a Sunday Evening’s Lecture on the Holy Scriptures, by the Rev F. D. Maurice, the Principal, who also took the departments of English Literature and Politics; then Algebra and Arithmetic, English Grammar, Drawing, Geography, History, and Languages, — Latin, and French. The average amount of pupils during the year is given as 140. At this present moment we are told the amount is considerably increased, and an evening adult school to prepare the more backward pupils for the College is also prospering.

In the first instance no attempt was made to include women in these classes; not because those who set them on foot considered it unnecessary or inexpedient to give similar advantages to the wives, sisters, or daughters of working men, but because of the obvious difficulties of such an addition at starting. After a time, however, a meeting of the members of the men’s college being called, it was determined to sound them as to *their own* views on the subject of female instruction: we give the result in Mr. Maurice’s own words.

‘They spoke with remarkable freedom and intelligence. We gathered a great many more hints and opinions, than we had at all expected. These were very different as to many points on which we consulted them; for instance, respecting the hours which would be most convenient for women to attend classes, and respecting the propriety of their being taught together with men or separate from

them. But there was entire unanimity on the main question. There was no indication whatever of the slightest fear that females should know as much as they themselves knew. There was a manifest wish that they should have the same advantages. There was a distinct and positive call upon us not to withhold from the one what we were trying to give to the other.' (*Introductory Lecture*, p. 3.)

'Nevertheless,' continues Mr. Maurice, 'when we reconsidered the subject among ourselves, we found that we were not ready;' and the result of much consultation led to the belief that the co-operation of ladies would be quite indispensable to the success of any scheme for the benefit of working women; whilst something of order and shape must be given to the undertaking, 'otherwise it would sink into a mere set of classes frequented for awhile by a few teachers and learners, and probably, at last, deserted by both.' Some of the ladies who had been consulted, and who fully agreed in the plan, suggested that the proper foundation for an institution professing to teach working women would be an institution in which ladies themselves should be taught to teach. 'Every one,' said they, 'fancies she can teach: it is really the hardest of all tasks—one in which those who have tried most feel that they want help.' This assertion by no means controverts the fact of the aptitude and instinct of woman for the teaching office—an instinct doubtless implanted for the wisest of purposes, since to her is committed so much of the guidance of childhood.

'But it is a hasty and blundering inference,' says Mr. Maurice, 'to assume that because God has bestowed a talent it does not need cultivation; that it may be left to chance; that it is sure to come forth and to exercise itself in a reasonable manner whenever there is occasion for it. . . . The born painter and musician is the one who takes most pains to cultivate the talent that is latent in him; the most thoroughly-born nurse will, I conceive, watch her endowment with the same care. I need not suggest to you the latest confirmation of this remark. The person who, we might have fancied, could have trusted her innate capacity for this occupation most, has been the person who has devoted the most steady and persevering efforts to improve her knowledge and practical skill under foreign masters and by native experience. Of all our motives for gratitude to Miss Nightingale, this is, perhaps, the greatest, that she has not allowed the doctrine that nursing comes by nature, as Dogberry says that reading and writing do, to sway her practice or weaken the effect of her example.' (*Introductory Lecture*, p. 15.)

This thought, then, or perhaps we should say this conviction, expressed by some women of judgment, and acted upon thus remarkably, not by Miss Nightingale alone, but by her con-

jutors, is the radical idea from which the course of Lectures to Ladies has sprung. Whether any organisation for 'teaching ladies to teach' is, or can be, formed, we are quite ignorant. The subject is wisely left open for remark and suggestion; but this at least may be said, that whatever be the result of the attempt to construct a college of lady-workers upon such a basis, it can do no ladies harm to read and consider the qualifications required and the knowledge recommended to all charitable and kindly women by the sagacious men who have delivered these lectures. We are perpetually hearing of women's desire to widen the sphere of their utility. But these valuable lessons may be carried to any part of London, of Great Britain, of the world. Thousands of miles away from home, in scenes of war, privation, and disease, no less than when—justice preceding charity—she rules over her own household, woman may be the better for many of the words uttered last July in the unfashionable little square in which the Working Men's College is established.

A glance at the subjects treated of—'the Influence of Occupation on Health—District Visiting—Sanitary Law—Dispensaries—the Causes of Mental and Bodily Disease among the Poor—the Country Parish,' &c, and a bare enumeration of the names of the gentlemen who delivered the lectures*, should be enough to ensure careful attention to them. We have already called them unfinished, and, in part, deficient in immediate application to the auditors. But the fact is, they seem to be all, more or less, introductory, not one of them pretending to do more than throw out hints on some particular want of society—to point out some scene in which woman's influence and exertions may do good. Not one absolutely 'teaches how to teach;' yet all contribute to that result; and we are not sure whether, on the whole, this want of positive application is injurious to their effect. Generally speaking, Lectures to Ladies are particularly small and unedifying. They are remarkable for an excessive deference to a female audience, and a subordinate recognition of the importance of the subject. But the Lecturers to Ladies, at Red Lion Square, put the subject in the first place, the auditory in the second; the happy consequence of which is, that there is hardly a direct compliment to Woman in the collection, while the combined

* Rev. F. D. Maurice, Rev. C. Kingsley, Dr. G. Johnson, Dr. Sieveking, Rev. J. Davies, Dr. Chambers, F. Stephen, Esq., Archdeacon Allen, Rev. R. C. Trench, Tom Taylor, Esq., and Rev. J. S. Brewer.

effect of the whole strikes us as one of the best and most respectful tributes that could be paid to women.

One doubtful kind of compliment in particular is especially disclaimed by Mr. Maurice. Too many of both sexes who have written about Woman and her vocation, base their plans of work for her on the consideration of the unhappy and purposeless existence of some among women. This is a very undignified view of the matter. It is not desirable that works of mercy should be constructed in order to employ the superfluous energy of woman, or merely to fill a void in her life; such plans assume what ought not for a moment to be admitted as the *rule* of woman's condition. How poor and how ungrateful a thing it is to complain, in the presence of Him who has placed woman where she is, and made her rich in a thousand blessings, that she cannot profit by these gifts and return them with interest, unless she be first taken out of her ordinary position! Inasmuch as the notion of sisterhoods encourages this low view of Woman's duties, we object to it, far more than for any other and minuter reasons. And yet it cannot be denied that there are cases in which such institutions would be a boon. There are ladies, who have no immediate family duties, who are not particularly fitted to be teachers, who perhaps have no taste for that employment, who are neither gifted, clever, nor independent, but who are members of a church and wish to work under her guidance. Why should they be made afraid of sisterhoods? Why repelled by sarcasm or stigmatised as 'inclined to Popery?' Let them have the help they desire; but let us remember that these are exceptional cases. The instances are probably very few in which a woman need desert the family life in order to exercise her benevolent propensities; or still fewer in which she would do so, did she know her own best interests. The objections to such a desertion are serious and not to be overcome. Seldom would the links, once broken, be reunited; seldom would the energies of such a life be productive of more than a dwarfed and mutilated virtue, savouring much of sickness and death; there would be neither time nor opportunity for learning what Mr. Maurice has aptly given as one of the characteristics of medical men, that, 'though continually looking on disease, they *believe* in health.' Medical men would not, we suspect, long retain that hearty and healthy faith if they lived in brotherhoods; neither will women if they betake themselves to sisterhoods. *

To return to the lectures. That by the Rev. Charles Kingsley will probably be the most popular; and it is a good specimen of this author's fearless and striking manner. No one

will suspect Mr. Kingsley of flattering the rich, on whom he is somewhat too apt to fall with less of justice than they deserve. Nothing can be better, however, than his present remarks on the bearing of ladies towards those whom they would relieve; but in such visits something beyond all courtesy is needed. How often must a candid visitor of the poor have been made to feel her own positive inferiority to the people she is sent to teach, even while the tones of humble deference come to her ears! In dilapidated dwellings, on beds of pain, in full view of cold and hunger and terrible disease and death, how often has the Christian patience of some poor man or woman struck her dumb! And it is when humbled thus, that the most real good is probably done; that things are said and heard which sink deep into the spirit, and send the Visitor home with a consciousness that she has *gained* more than it was possible for her to *give*.

It is plain that this whole matter of visiting among the poor, whether isolated or organised visiting be in question, is the subject of much anxiety to many of the lecturers, to the clerical even more than to the medical. It is no wonder it should be so. All see how dangerous a thing it would be to check these intercourses; often the sole means by which the rich obtain an insight into the struggles of the poor. Yet we are constantly made aware of other dangers arising out of visiting; and especially of District Visiting. Perhaps the Rev. J. H. Davies, who has adopted that subject for his own, unexceptionable as are in general his remarks, uses without sufficient caution the argument of a benevolent person, who is supposed to say — ‘I keep up an acquaintance by means of calls with many of my own class, for which I have no excuse but a casual introduction; why should I not have acquaintance with poor people as well, based on the securer and firmer ground of Christian kindness and religious duty?’ But this line of argument, unanswerable in as far as isolated calls on the poor are concerned, wholly fails as applied to district visiting. Once apportion to a lady a certain court, street, or alley, and it is inevitable that the poor in that district, who perfectly understand the machinery, come to regard themselves as the inspected, and the lady as the inspector. Disguise it as we may, that is *their* view of the matter. The candid Christian will trust the statements of those she visits, till she can trust no longer; but it is very difficult to preserve herself from adopting, more or less, the detective frame of mind; sympathy with the good is very apt to be overpowered by experience of the bad. And, with regard to the poor themselves, the attitude in which

they feel themselves placed is by no means favourable to perfect truthfulness. The families visited learn almost imperceptibly to put themselves into order (or perhaps *disorder*) when the visitor's step is heard, or a glimpse of her presence is caught. They who, though now borne down by adversity, have preserved remnants of respectability, have their doubts whether the sight of these remnants will not injure their chance of help. The temptation not to look too neat, or above the need of relief, is very strong; and the visitor's heart may well ache, under the apprehension that she has been instrumental in lowering the moral courage of those she wished to serve.

These remarks do not apply in the same degree to less regulated visiting. Here a visitor calls, perhaps, on some special errand: a child is ill, or absent from school. A visit of inquiry brings her acquainted with the family; a father is found to be out of work; sometimes he honestly owns, under the influence of gratitude for some kindness shown to the suffering member of the household, that he has been in fault: has displeased his employer, and wishes to be reconciled. It may be, that the very utterance of free speech, the opening his mind to some one, disposes him to go and make his apology. Once in a while a visitor may mediate between the master and the man. So the circle widens and spreads, and who can tell the misery which that one kind woman's call may have averted? And here it is impossible not to allude to a work most fruitful in suggestion on this subject. We mean that part of Mrs. Gaskell's '*North and South*,' which portrays the gradually acquired ascendancy of Margaret over the radical and infidel weaver, Nicholas Higgins. The more nearly it is examined, the more genuine and free from blemish does this picture appear. Humility and deep sympathy, on one side, meet in time with the due abatement of pride on the other: the whole coming quite within the range of ordinary probabilities.

One lecture in the present series, bearing much upon the subject of isolated visits and their consequences, we must notice. The subject is '*Overwork, distress, and anxiety, as causes of mental and bodily disease.*' The lecturer, Dr. Johnson, gives us many melancholy, but well-ascertained, facts. The vast increase of insanity among the lower classes can be no matter of indifference to any one; but from this able statement of the causes which often produce the calamity, and the strong possibility of their removal, in many cases, we augur well. It is, at least, the opinion of the medical lecturer that many a patient might be saved from a life-long residence in a lunatic asylum, by the timely joint attention of the physician and some kind

visitor to his case. Dr. Johnson illustrates this by a variety of examples which have come under his own eyes. Here is exactly that call for combined work which needs to be answered. If the female visitor alone is employed, there is danger of the mental disease being increased. The nerves may be stimulated by the tone of religious exhortations, when every soothing influence is required. But let the sound counsels of the medical man be attended to—let him be allowed to point out the nature of the malady—and, while the visitor believes in that higher healing power which comes from above, even as the doctor ‘believes in health,’ a happy practical result might ensue.

What these lecturers and ladies, who have met together as teachers and taught, are going further to do, we know not. It will not satisfy the one party to have said excellent things, nor the other to have heard them. One object at least, dear to the hearts of good men and women everywhere, they have certainly advanced—we mean, that communion of labour between the sexes, which one of the lecturers well calls ‘an essential constituent of modern progress and Christian civilisation.’ Efforts to bridge over the deep chasms between the different classes of society, especially in large towns, require this preliminary adjustment of our forces, and there is everything to make us hope that this work is going on. To instance our literature: look at the best of our books, penned by the best men as well as the most perfect writers of our day, and how do they teem with large sympathies with women! Whether we instance the less direct but refined observations of such a writer as the author of ‘*Friends in Council*,’ or whether we point to what M. Guizot has so beautifully said of the character of Lady Russell, the cheering inference is the same. These men, themselves an honour to their times, do honour to women by giving her the benefit of the best thoughts of manly minds. In the view of such encouragement all petty jealousies and warfares between the sexes seem infinitely too small for notice, and may well pass into the region of forgotten things. Never was there, indeed, a time at which greater mutual esteem, and a more earnest participation in the great duties of humanity, prevailed than that which exists between Englishmen and Englishwomen of the present age.

And, surely, we may be permitted, before we dismiss this subject, to advert to that example of courageous duty, on the part of women, which has kindled so much of our admiration during the past year, and claimed its place amongst the noblest trophies of war. Sisters of Mercy have before now performed Miss Nightingale’s part—perhaps performed it as well; but

the habits of English life, and the reserve of Protestant society, threw difficulties in the path of herself and many of her coadjutors, which would not have presented themselves in other countries. They went, unfettered by vows, undeterred by the appearance of singularity, to do a great and good work; and they now receive, as is fit, their country's thanks and the deep sympathy of good men and women everywhere. But this is not the end of the matter. From the high and the low, from the most noble among the subscribers to the Nightingale Fund to the humblest ballad singers who are singing Miss Nightingale's praises in our streets*, we learn lessons of faith in the readiness with which man's esteem is given where it is earned by woman. Her whole sex will profit by the reflection of the light her example has shed upon us; and it is to be hoped that many a woman will feel it both a responsibility and an encouragement that she has lived at the same time with Florence Nightingale.

ART. VI. — *Report of the Commissioners for the Investigation of alleged Cases of Torture in the Madras Presidency.* Submitted to the Governor in Council of Fort St. George, on the 16th April, 1855, and presented to Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1855.

ONE of the worst and most inveterate evils in the social condition of the unhappy kingdom of Oude described in our last Number, is the land-system, which constitutes the main source of its direct revenue,—a system so oppressive to the cultivator, so corrupt in its administration, so inconsistent, in a word, with every principle of justice, humanity, and good government, that our most enlightened statesmen have not hesitated to denounce the very treaty by which Great Britain has pledged herself to maintain the integrity of the kingdom in which such a system exists, as a standing blot upon the British name.

It would be well, however, for British honour, if the Indian Government were not chargeable with anything worse than passive acquiescence in this guarantee. Unhappily, our own land system, even in British India, inherited from the various native governments to which we have succeeded in that vast

* This is a fact. A very decent and respectable, though, certainly, not very poetical Ballad, is now to be heard and read in the district of Seven Dials, in praise of 'the Nightingale in the East.'

region, is, in its leading principles, the same as that which, in Oude, has been the source of so many horrors. Unhappily, too, our administration of this system, although far more merciful than that of the native governments, has not been such as to put an end to the traditional evils which have attended the collection of the land revenue in every part of India.

Among those who have given any attention to Indian affairs, an impression has long been current, that such abuses prevail to a considerable extent; and that stringent proceedings are frequently required, as well to check the corruption of the native officials, as to protect the native population from their unjust and arbitrary exactions. Few, however, even of the best informed, had ventured to picture to themselves anything approaching to the startling reality which the Report at the head of these pages has just disclosed. It was believed in a general way that the machinery for the collection of the land-tax was complicated and unsatisfactory; but the exact mode of its working was entirely unknown. It was known that the method of assessing its amount was arbitrary in its nature, and operated as a permanent and fatal check upon the spirit of enterprise and the desire of improvement; but with the details of this and other practical grievances few persons out of India possessed any acquaintance.

Accordingly, when, in the debate which took place in the House of Commons, June 11. 1854, on the motion of Mr. Blackett, the member for Newcastle, for a 'Commission of Inquiry into the Tenure of Land in the Madras Presidency,' it was formally alleged, that, in the collection of the land revenue in that Presidency, the Government officials were in the habit of *employing torture*, the statement was received with amazement by the great body of the House, and was treated with indignant incredulity by those who are supposed to represent the interests of India in Parliament, and to possess the fullest and most authentic information on all her internal affairs. The President of the Board of Control 'heard the allegation for the first time that evening.' When Mr. Danby Seymour, who had visited India with the professed object of obtaining accurate information upon the spot, laid before the House the result of his own observations and of his inquiries throughout a large portion of Southern India, he was met by the Chairman of the Board of Directors with ridicule rather than serious argument. Mr. Mangles 'solemnly declared, that, during the many years he had been in India, he had never heard of a single case of torture having been resorted to in Madras for the purpose of collecting the revenue.' Mr. Elliot, who had lived thirty

'years in India and in connexion with its administration,' echoed the denial. He had never 'known of torture being used for the purpose of collecting rent; he had never heard of such a thing till it was mentioned in the debate; and he did not believe that such a practice existed at Bengal or Madras.' Notwithstanding these solemn, and seemingly authoritative, denials, the statement was confidently persisted in; and, in the end, the President of the Board of Control, while he reiterated his own personal disbelief of the allegation, nevertheless, as the charge had been made, and as it was impossible that he could give it an authoritative contradiction without reference to Madras, undertook that inquiry should be made.*

Such was the origin of the Commission whose report now lies before us. But, although the impulse came from home, it would be most unjust to deny to the local Government of Madras the credit of promptness and candour in meeting the appeal. For, while, with the same inexplicable ignorance that the home authorities upon Indian affairs had manifested, of what now appears to have been perfectly notorious in India, Lord Harris, the governor of Madras, himself expressed his disbelief of the allegation, and, in the very minute in which the inquiry was ordered, declared that he 'would not have hesitated to repel it on the part of the Covenanted Service, did he not feel that a mere general denial would not be satisfactory to the officers of the Service themselves;' the Commission which he appointed for the purpose received most ample powers, and was instructed to institute a thoroughly searching inquiry. Not a day was lost: the debate in the House of Commons took place on the 11th of July, 1854, and the minute of consultation directing the inquiry is dated the 9th of September, less than two months after the discussion, and almost as early as it was possible to receive the intelligence through the ordinary Indian Mail. Three commissioners of the highest reputation for integrity and ability were at once named. Instructions were issued without delay to all the collectors, assistant collectors, surgeons, chaplains, and other officials connected with the service, to render to the inquiry every assistance in their power; and especially to furnish detailed answers to certain specific queries bearing upon the main points of the allegation. The widest publicity was given to the opening of the Commission, and to the objects which it proposed. All persons who had been aggrieved by any of the alleged practices, or who were

able to give any information as to the existence of such practices, were invited, by notifications printed in each of the dialects of the presidency, and extensively circulated through every district without exception, to state their grievances, either in person or by letter, to the Commissioners. Ample provision was made for the expenses of witnesses volunteering such information. A day was fixed, before which it was required that all cases for investigation should be notified at the office of the Commission; and, with a degree of energy which contrasts not unfavourably with the slowness of some of our own parliamentary inquiries, the Report, a very full, careful and laborious document, was submitted to the Governor in Council within ten months from the date of the discussion in the House of Commons. We regret to add that this Report substantiates with the most painful minuteness, and illustrates by most revoltingly circumstantial details, the justice and accuracy of all the charges made in the memorable debate of July, as to the practices employed for the purpose of collecting the land revenue in the Madras Presidency.

The subject is of such exceeding importance, and concerns so nearly, not only the welfare of our fellow subjects in India, but our honour and good name as a nation, that, painful as it is, we feel it a duty to enter into it without delay, and to detail without reserve the results of the inquiry.

We have frequently alluded in this Journal to the difficult and complicated subject of the tenure of land in India; nor are we to be understood as desiring, in the present instance, to discuss the subject on its own merits, or, in our strictures upon these abuses, to imply a general condemnation of the system in itself. On the contrary we beg to be understood as confining ourselves to the single inquiry which forms the subject of the Madras Report, and which, in accordance with the instructions of the Governor in Council, expressly excludes the question 'whether the land-tax be immoderate or not?' We cannot hope, however, to render the proceedings of the recent Commission fully intelligible, without, in the first place, briefly explaining so much of the land system of India as is peculiar to the Presidency of Madras.

The land-tenure which prevails in Madras is that known as the *ryotwarry system*; in which the cultivators (*ryots*) hold directly under the Government, without the intervention of any intermediate agent as in the *zemindarry* or village systems which prevail in other presidencies. In the *ryotwarry system*, therefore, the Government holds the place of direct landlord. All the details of assessment are matter for arrangement directly

between the Government and the individual ryot, without any intermediate agent whatsoever. Every Government transaction connected with the Madras land-tax resolves itself simply into a question of landlord and tenant; the collection of the tax, in all its particulars, is exclusively in the hands of Government, and is conducted by its own officers, without the control of any intermediate authority or influence whatsoever.

The case of the Madras Presidency, therefore, is a peculiar one; and it will readily be understood from what we have said, how intimately and how directly the national honour is involved in every imputation which is directed against the collectors of the land revenue in that presidency. In the other districts of India the direct collection of the land revenues from the cultivator may be said to lie in private hands. The Government is, at most, but the head landlord; and, provided it receives from the several middle-men the stipulated amount of head-rent, it may throw upon these various middlemen the odium, as it leaves to them the profit and the responsibility, of all transactions connected with the collection of the tax from those who, speaking technically, are but their under tenants.

It is true that the ryotwarry system is common with Madras to a portion of the Bombay Presidency. But there is one peculiarity in the system as it exists in Madras, which deserves to be especially noticed. In Bombay the tax is fixed by a permanent assessment, under which the land is held by the ryot for a term of thirty years. Moreover, an accurate and well registered survey has there been made, by which the land of each village is valued, classified, and divided into fields averaging about fifteen acres. The portions thus classified are let to the ryots at this known and settled valuation; and, during the term of their possession, the ryots, as long as the rated assessment continues to be paid, enjoy full liberty to cultivate, to improve, to mortgage, and even to alienate their respective holdings. In a word, their tenure corresponds with that of an English leasehold. In Madras, on the contrary, there is no permanent settlement and no fixed assessment. The ryot is at the mercy of the collector as to the amount of his land-tax, as to the cultivation of his land, and as to the permanency of his tenure. He is liable to be assessed for his own improvements, and even to be ejected from the possession of them. His position exactly corresponds with that of a tenant-at-will in the very worst and most dependent sense of the name. And further, in the arrangement of all these petty details of occupancy, the Government, through its own officials, is again the direct and immediate actor. For every increased valuation, for

every interference with the liberty or the mode of cultivation, for every disturbance or change of tenancy, the Government is directly and immediately responsible. The startling question, therefore, which the Madras Commissioners had to try was, not whether instances of landlord oppression, even in the revolting form of torture, had occurred in the Madras Presidency, but whether Government itself, in its capacity of universal landlord, were not, through its own native officials, chargeable with these atrocities.

Nor is it to be supposed that the question regarded any remote period, before British rule had been consolidated in India, or the protection of British Law had been extended to the subjects of our new empire. We are denied even this palliative for our wounded national pride. For, although it is well known that the same practices existed formerly, and even in greater rigour than in later years, yet, as it would have been practically impossible to investigate charges of a very distant date, the inquiry was judiciously restricted to the last seven years. All the cases referred to, therefore, fall within that period, and the vast majority of them occurred within the two or three last years.

Originally too the inquiry was confined to Revenue cases; but, by a second instruction, the Commissioners were ordered to extend their investigation to the alleged use of torture for Police purposes, as the extorting confessions from suspected offenders, compelling reluctant witnesses to speak, &c. We shall confine ourselves chiefly to the former branch of the inquiry, though we shall also advert occasionally to the abuses committed by the police officials.

But while we address ourselves chiefly to one of the counts of the indictment against the Government, it is painful to be obliged to record that upon both a verdict of 'Guilty' has been returned. The Commissioners declare, (p. 45.), as 'the only conclusion which any impartial minds could arrive at,' that 'personal violence practised by the native revenue and police officials generally prevails throughout the Presidency;' and, adverting to the objection taken by some of the witnesses to describing under the name 'torture' the 'personal violence,' the use of which is clearly proved, they declare their conviction, that, if the word 'torture' be used in the ordinary acceptation assigned to it by Dr. Johnson, 'pain by which guilt is punished, or confession (and they would add, money) extorted,' this word may, 'with perfect propriety, be applied to designate the practices prevalent in Madras.' They add, indeed, that it is beyond all dispute 'that many of the practices which indubitably must cause acute, if temporary or even momentary,

'agony; and that in no few recorded instances (as appears by the calendars), even death has followed upon their infliction.'

The evidence upon which this verdict is founded is exceedingly copious and diversified. Part is drawn from the official returns of a class of European witnesses who would be deeply interested in concealing the facts if it had been possible to do so—the collectors, sub-collectors, judges, magistrates, surgeons, and other civil servants of the Government; part from the testimony of merchants, clergymen, and others unconnected with the administration; but by far the most curious and interesting portion consists of the written or oral statements of the aggrieved parties themselves. Native testimony in India is proverbially deceitful, and there is no proposition which may not be established in an Indian Court of Justice by prepared witnesses; but in this case, the Commissioners themselves declare that the variety and extent of the evidence precludes the possibility of fraud.

'In consequence of a certain notification, disseminated almost simultaneously over the whole Presidency, without any previous warning or notice, 1959 complaints were preferred within the space of three months, by parties, the great majority of whom could have had no means of acting in concert, poor, ignorant, and penniless, dwelling at great distances from, and totally unknown to each other, and using even various languages; yet these complaints, one and all, speak to similar facts, detail similar practices, ascribe similar causes for their treatment. If this be a concocted plan it is the most singular conspiracy in the world's history; but indeed the above conditions preclude the possibility of any other conclusion than that the acts of violence complained of are commonly practised.' (*Report*, p. 16.)

From an exact analysis of the various complaints laid before the Commission from persons actually put to torture by the police or revenue officials, we find that, of the class of police cases, 27 individuals complained in person before the Commissioners, and 146 by letter: while, in the class of revenue cases, no less than 209 complained personally, and 279 by letter. In reference to the practice of torture in the former service, out of 109 answers returned from the various stations in the Madras Presidency, 30 were neutral, not a single one was negative, while no less than 79 were unhesitatingly in the affirmative; and out of the 121 answers returned to the queries sent out regarding the use of torture in the collection of revenue, while 17 officials expressed their disbelief of the use of torture

for such a purpose, and 7 professed to have no knowledge on the subject, no fewer than 98 returned an unequivocal affirmative. In a word, the array of evidence from every quarter, official and unofficial, interested and uninterested, friendly, unfriendly, and neutral, is so overwhelming as to exclude the possibility, we do not say of disbelief, but even of hesitation, and to reduce our function in reference to the inquiry to that of simply detailing its results.

The tortures which the Commissioners find to have been employed are of various kinds and of different degrees of severity. Some of them are so light as to amount to little more than a menace. Some are so severe as to cause not only extreme present pain, but permanent injuries, mutilation, and even, not unfrequently, death. Some of them exhibit an amount of diabolical ingenuity on the part of the torturer, and a degree of moral abasement and degradation in the victim, of which our western minds can hardly form a conception; some, in fine, are so loathsome and indecent, and at the same time so excruciating, that, although they are set down nakedly in the Report, we must abstain from any specific allusion to their nature.

The two most common forms of torture appear to be the *Kittee* (in Telooogo called *Cheerata*), and the *Anundal*, which in the same language is called *Gingeri*.

The *kittee* corresponds with the thumbscrew of the European torturer. It is a wooden instrument somewhat like a *lemon-squeezer*, between the plates of which the hands, the thighs, (in women also the breasts,) the ears, and other more sensitive parts of the body, are squeezed to the last point of endurance, often to fainting, and even to permanent disablement. In many places the *kittee* has been superseded by the more simple plan of violently compressing the hands under a flat board, on which a heavy pressure is laid, *sometimes even by the peons standing upon it*; or of compelling the sufferer to interlace his fingers, and delivering him over to the iron gripe of the peons (or policemen), who sometimes rub their hands with sand, in order to give them a firmer gripe. In other cases* the fingers are bent back till the pain becomes unendurable.

The *anundal* is a more purely eastern torture. It consists in tying the victim in a stooping or otherwise painful and unnatural position, generally with the head forcibly bent down to the

* Art. C. 14. p. cliii. The references are to the Madras edition of the Report and Evidence.

feet, by a rope or cloth passed round the neck and under the toes. The posture, however, is varied at the caprice of the executioner. Sometimes the poor wretch is made to stand on one leg, the other being forcibly tied up to his neck. Sometimes the arms and legs are curiously interlaced, and the frame, thus violently distorted, is kept bound up for hours, in a condition little short of dislocation. Sometimes a heavy stone is laid upon the back, while thus bent; and it often happens that the peons amuse themselves by sitting astride upon the unhappy sufferer who is undergoing anundal. More than one of the witnesses depose to the infliction of this torture under the fierce Indian sun, upon a number of defaulters placed together in rows, for two, three, four, and even six hours; and this in the immediate vicinity of the cutcherry, or revenue office, and in the presence of the tahsildar, or native collector, and of the assembled villagers.

These tortures are often used simultaneously: the kittee being applied to a man's hands, ears, or thighs, while he is actually undergoing anundal.

Flogging in various forms is also one of the ordinary instruments for the collection of revenue. In most cases the defaulter is hung up by the arms to a tree, or to the roof beam of a house, as a preparation for the lash, which consists either of a scourge of leather thongs (called *cornechewar*, and sometimes *jerbund*), or of the tough fibres of the tamarind tree, or of the coir rope. Many witnesses complained of having been flogged to laceration.

Various other minor, but yet most degrading and painful, species of violence are detailed. One of them, *thoodasavary*, consists in pulling the person about violently by pinching the thighs, whether with the kittee or by a hand-gripe. Another, *kalthoosavary*, is pulling a man about by the ears. Occasionally a man is held aloft from the ground by the ears, by the hair, and even by the moustachio; and the latter torture, in some instances, is applied so savagely as to tear away the moustachio by the roots. Sometimes a sort of bastinado is inflicted, sometimes violent blows on the shin, the ankles, the elbows, or other highly sensitive points. Prolonged immersion in the water-tanks or the river; forcible compression of the arms, the thighs, and even the body, by tying a coil of coir rope round them, and then applying cold water so as to cause it to contract and sink into the flesh; burning with hot iron; hanging heavy stones round the neck; the stocks; tying two or more individuals together by the hair, so that every movement is attended with pain; placing a necklace of bones or

other disgusting or degrading materials round the neck;—these are a few of the minor inflictions devised by these masters of the oriental school of torture. If we add to these a few practices like those used at home by amateurs of the turf or the ring, for the purpose of ‘reducing flesh;’ such as starvation, prolonged deprivation of sleep, compulsory driving up and down under a broiling sun; forcing the unhappy wretches to run long distances, their hands being tied to the axle of a bandy, or country carriage,—we think the catalogue of torture will be admitted to be tolerably complete.

And yet there are other devices, that evince in their very conception an amount of hateful ingenuity which, however possible in an individual, it would be difficult to understand as forming part of a system, were they not seriously detailed by the witnesses examined before the Commission. Will it be credited, for example, that it is not uncommon to apply to the most sensitive parts of the body (enclosed in a cloth or a cocoanut shell, or other similar receptacle), *a biting insect or reptile*, such as the poolah, or carpenter-beetle, and to leave it to gnaw the flesh of the miserable sufferer? * That by a further refinement of cruelty, meant to combine both pain and humiliation, the defaulters are sometimes tied by the hair to the tail of a donkey or a buffalo? That they are occasionally hung up with the head downwards? And that it is an ordinary practice to put pepper or powdered chillies into the eyes or the nostrils, and to apply these and similar irritating drugs in other ways too revolting to be even hinted at?

The general evidences of the use of these several varieties of torture for the purpose of extorting revenue are but too abundant. Appendix E. contains a selection of the depositions of the sufferers. It would be unjust, however, to the officers whose administration is compromised by these accusations, to put forward the depositions of native witnesses without some qualification. Many of the documents which came before the Commissioners contain very curious illustrations of the caution with which native complaints of personal injury must be received. The most groundless charges of petty assault are often found supported by an elaborate array of confirmatory circumstances,—‘garments drenched in blood, the body smeared with plaster, ‘the sufferer borne helplessly by his friends,’ even in cases in which, after the matter has been decided by the court, ‘the sufferer may be seen walking away unconcernedly.’ * It is common, too, for, the natives who prefer charges, whether

* App. C. 14. p. cliii.

* App. C. lxxiii.

against officials or against each other, to 'come up and display every variety of bruise or wound they may have received, and sometimes also scars and plasters which are found to cover a whole skin.'*

It is right that this caution should be borne in mind while we endeavour to form a judgment from the depositions or the written statements of the native complainants. Nevertheless, it must also be remembered, that the depositions contained in the Appendix E. are by no means an average specimen of native Indian evidence; that they are not presented to us, till after they have undergone the ordeal of scrutiny at the hands of gentlemen of much Indian experience, and well versed in the practices of native witnesses. The native evidence printed by the Commissioners, therefore, comes before us with, at least, a certain stamp of authenticity. We are not called upon to regard it as unquestionable, but we must not, at least, put it aside as *primâ facie* suspected; especially as a large portion of it consists of cases which have actually come before the courts of justice in India.

With these preliminary remarks, we leave the reader to form his own judgment regarding it.

A few instances will suffice, as a sample of the painful and humiliating tenor of the whole volume. The very first in the series might be sufficient to establish the entire case.

Seenoo Raugaviengar, of the village of Arimbaucom, in the Arcot district, states, that in conjunction with three others he had partially cultivated, from the time of the Nabob, about a hundred cawnies of land attached to the village. In May 1854, for some reason not specified in the statement, they were called upon by the Naib Seristadar to sell the land, at a stated sum, to an English purchaser; on refusing which demand, they were detained at Arcot for forty days, deprived of their meals, and (a severe punishment to strict Hindoos) prevented from performing their usual ceremonies. When they declared their final determination, matters became much more serious: 'I and my three partners,' the complainant states, 'were made to stoop, ropes were placed round our necks, and tied to our feet to keep our heads as low as our knees; and, in this posture, with a stone as large as the crown of a hat on our backs, we were made to stand in the sun for four Indian hours, in the public road; and this occurred to me four different times.' He adds that the Seristadar was present during the infliction of this outrage; that they were ill-treated in various other ways; pushed about

by the neck, and pinched upon the thighs; and that, in the end, the land was taken from them and given to the English claimant. He further declares that he was treated similarly, and even more severely, on four or five other occasions, by the tahsildar (collector) for nonpayment of the kist (land-tax) of his village, which it was his business to collect and pay.*

This, it will be seen, is a simple case of the torture called *anundal*. In another instance, Thumbec Moodely, of the village of Alwalom, a defaulter in the payment of kist to the amount of fifteen rupees, was merely subjected to the torture of the *kittee*, which was applied by order of the tahsildar in person. But, in most cases, both these forms of torture are employed conjointly, and generally in combination with other forms of violence and indignity.

Thus (that the full extent of these revolting practices may be understood), Venkiah, a ryot of the village of Cherookoorapaudoo, in Ponnalore, having incurred the enmity of the tahsildar by refusing a bribe which he demanded, was put to the torture to compel payment of a claim of eight rupees, which Venkiah contested: 'his head was tied to his feet in a stooping posture; *'the kittee was applied to his ears; and he was kept in this position from eight in the morning till noon, and only released on payment of the claim; in order to which he was necessitated to sell one of his working buffaloes.'* Another unfortunate ryot, named Kistniar, in the district of South Arcot (in which these practices appear to be especially common), was called on for a balance of twenty rupees of the land-tax. Alleging that he had sent his crop to Pondicherry for sale, he begged a delay of four days; but it was savagely refused; and 'by the order, and in the presence, of the tahsildar,' the peons 'first struck him several times,' afterwards 'placed a kittee on each of his hands, *on which they stood till he fell down with pain;*' on his being lifted up, they 'pinched him upon the thighs till he fell down a second time.' The worst feature in this miserable case is, that, on his complaining to the English head-assistant-collector, he was told, that 'if he had paid the money, this treatment would not have occurred.'† Abookara Saib, for a similarly disputed claim, was (to use his own broken English) 'caused to be placed in *anundal, with so short a rope as two cubits in length; kittee,*' he adds, 'was applied to my hands, and *screwed so violently as the bones of the fingers may appear and the blood gush out;* they pinched my thighs so hard as *their skins may be flayed; flogged, kicked, and boxed me; and*

‘for three hours I was kicked to and fro, and subjected to various ‘tortures.’* The poor man still bore on his person the marks of this violence.

In the village of Syadoorgum (in the Cuddalore district), Soobapatha Pillay was ‘*tied by the legs, and hung up with his head ‘downwards’; ‘they put powdered chilli in his nostrils’*;’ and passed a strong tape round his waist and violently tightened it. Other details of the torture inflicted on this wretch are too revoltingly indecent to be referred to.† It is right to add, however, that this was a police, rather than a revenue case.

Vencatachella Rajaulec, in conjunction with his father, was put to torture, in order to compel payment of an extraordinary assessment of ten rupees. They were ‘both placed in anundal, ‘their legs tied together, and their heads tied to their feet in ‘a stooping posture; their hands were tied behind them, and ‘stones placed upon their backs;’ in which posture they were ‘made to stand from six in the morning until noon.’‡ It will hardly be matter of surprise that *the father died in the following month!*§ When the unfortunate survivor complained to the English collector at Puttoocottah, he was told that that functionary ‘had nothing to do with it,’ and that he ‘must go to ‘the sub-collector;’ and upon his referring to the sub-collector personally, the answer was, that ‘the sub-collector could not ‘take notice of the complaint, as the *tahsildar* had not reported ‘the circumstances to him!’

The process often takes place in even a more wholesale way. Runjah Chetty, in company with ‘about fifty others,’ was tortured by being ‘kept in a stooping posture by the peons ‘holding them down by the hair lock, whilst others were placed ‘astride on their backs.’|| Vanamoortha Nada Pillay, and other natives of the village of Saurumnadavy, were subjected to a repetition of this torture from the month of June till August, in order to force them into a payment of land-tax of which they claimed a remission on account of the failure of *Peesanum* (the principal *paddy* or rice crop.) ‘I and others,’ he states, ‘were ‘given by the *tahsildar*, Apparoo Moodelly, in charge to peons, ‘who used to take us out in the sun, sometimes to a rock on the ‘north of our town, sometimes to the sand near the hill. There ‘we were made to stoop, and stones were put on our backs; and ‘we were kept on the burning sand. After eight o’clock we ‘were allowed to go to our rice. Such like ill-treatment was

* App. F. 8. p. lxxxiii.

† App. E. 15. p. xix.

|| Ib. p. xxiv.

† App. E. 4. p. vi.

§ Ib. p. xx.

'continued during three months.' In addition to the violence and pain to which these villagers were subjected, *their 'women were also ill-treated and the kittee applied to their breasts.'** Captain Nelson of Ongole saw four men just released from the punishment of anundal.† Mr. Simpson, at Budwail, in the Cuddapah district, saw 'at least a dozen ryots undergoing the 'ordeal. They were all ranged in the courtyard of the Revenue 'Office, under a meridian sun; they had heavy stones placed 'either on their backs, or between the shoulders; their bodies 'were bent double, and several of them were kept in that posi- 'tion, standing on one leg, the other being raised from the 'ground by means of a string-going round the neck and round 'the big toe; and this continued probably for two hours, cer- 'tainly for more than one.' Appanda Nynar of Terooparam- boor, after detailing his own wrongs, declares that in his district 'all defaulters are treated in the same way;' and he adds that he 'has seen *great numbers* not only placed in anundal, but the 'kittee applied to their fingers;' and that 'there is a whip hung 'in the cutcherry (revenue office) with three thongs, which is also 'used on Indian defaulters but not on Brahmins.‡ Nullandy Naik complains that his son and his son's wife, on suspicion of being concerned in a robbery, were hanged up by the hands to the branch of a tamarind tree for an Indian hour, and beaten with tamarind switches, in the presence of the tahsildar. *The woman died in eight days afterwards.* Naik complained to the judge, but 'no notice was taken.'§ Three ryots of the village of Coviloor were seized at night on a similar suspicion, taken to a cowshed, tied up by the hands to the roof of the shed, and beaten till they consented to buy themselves off by a bribe of twenty-five rupees. They also 'complained to the magistrate, 'and proved their statement, both as to the beating and the extor- 'tion; but they got no redress.'||

There is not one of the forms of torture here described, of which the Appendix of the Report does not contain some examples. The use of the lash and the cudgel is frequent and unsparing. Besides the cases already referred to, in which it is casually mentioned, Panpoo, of the village of Arcot, for a paltry claim of six rupees, was beaten by one of the peons with his leathern belt till it flew in pieces; and then the punishment was continued with tamarind twigs, till his back bled under the infliction. His brother, who meanwhile arrived

* App. E. 23. p. xxviii.

† App. E. 38. xlvii.

|| App. E. 42. p. l.

‡ App. D. p. cciv.

§ App. E. 41. p. xlix.

with the money, and ventured to remonstrate against this cruelty, 'was also beaten with tamarind twigs till the blood 'came.' They complained to the tahsildar; but 'he dismissed 'them, saying, "What complaint is there, when you were "flogged for not paying the Circar money?"'* Soobboo Roya Iyer, in addition to the torture of the kittee, received 'ten cuts of a whip made of the strong fibres of a tree;' he adds that he has 'frequently been placed in anundal, tied up, 'rolled about, and struck.'† The cruel and degrading device of *tying defaulters together by their coodmy* (the back knot of hair) was employed in the case of Iyah Pillay, a villager of Malapadacum in Tanjore.‡ Chellappa Reddy was *seized by the ears*, and pulled to the ground; and, after he had fallen, the castigation was persisted in till he fainted. He complained by letter to the collector, but received no answer.§ The cruel practice of 'inflicting smart blows on the ankle bones with a 'short thick stick is not uncommon.¶ Verasawmy Naidoo and Iyappa Naidoo were tortured by the application of a rope tightly wound round the thighs, 'so as to force the blood into 'the feet, which causes great pain.'¶ Asoonachella Moodelly was '*lifted up by a peon by the moustaches*, and one side of the 'moustache pulled out.'* Upwards of forty 'headmen and 'ryots' of Patamata village, in the Masulipatam district, complain that, besides other maltreatment, 'heavy stones were 'hung round their necks.'†† And to cap the climax of inventive cruelty, we need but add Captain Campbell's description of another form of torture, which consists in causing the prisoner 'to squat, so that the posteriors touch the ground; the arms are 'then placed under and inside the thighs, *and he is made to take 'hold of his ears, one with each hand!*' A peon stands over him 'with a cane, and, whenever he attempts to move, strikes him.' Captain Campbell may well add that 'this constrained position, 'though not in itself to a supple-jointed person very painful, 'becomes so after a very short time; and, when at all protracted, 'causes the most intolerable agony.'‡‡ It should be observed, that, in this and many other forms of punishment in which the victim is compelled to remain in a fixed posture, such as standing upon one leg, remaining uncovered in the burning sun, or barefooted in the scorching sand, supporting a heavy stone on

* App. E. 43. p. li.

† App. F. 20. p. cxiv.

‡ App. C. No. 20.

** App. E. 23. p. xxvii.

†† App. C. p. cccv.

† App. F. 22.

§ App. E. 25. p. xxxvii-viii.

¶ App. E. 16. p. xxi.

‡‡ App. F. 29. p. cxxx.

the bent neck or shoulders, the presence of one or more peons, armed with whips or other similar instruments of castigation, is an invariable accompaniment. Weak and unresisting as is this crushed and trodden-down race, it would else be hard to understand, how any one, with even the outward forms of manhood, could submit to such unspeakable degradation.

We have felt it a duty, though it has been a painful one, to go through these wearisome and revolting details, because we believe that the honour of the Indian Government, as well as the common interests of humanity, are involved in the issue of the important challenge which has led to their disclosure. It is right and necessary that we should know in England what is done in our name in these distant dependencies of our empire. To shut our eyes to any portion of the injustice, is to assume the responsibility by passive, but not therefore less guilty, complicity. Tardy as the arrival of the day of enlightenment has been, it has come at last. The cry of a wronged and outraged people, long and jealously stifled, has at length forced itself not alone upon the ears of our rulers, but upon our own; and, as long as this sad plaint remains unredressed through our guilty inactivity, so long, if we prove indifferent, shall every stroke of the lash, every turn of the thumb-screw, and every more loathsome and revolting indignity, throughout the length and breadth of India, be added to the catalogue of our own national responsibilities.

The most startling aspect of the case, considered in its bearing upon ourselves in England, and upon the control which we are supposed to exercise over the Government of India, is, we must repeat it, the inexplicable and disgraceful ignorance which has hitherto prevailed, not alone among the general public, but even among the highest of the home officials and those who are most directly engaged in Indian affairs. One might suppose that practices of the nature described above could hardly fail to attract the notice, if not of the general community, at least of the civil and criminal functionaries connected with the Indian Service. Yet, as we have already seen, when Mr. Danby Seymour made his statement, gentlemen who had been thirty years connected with India or resident therein, declared that they had never known of a single case of torture. The President of the Board of Control professed to have heard the charge for the first time that evening; the Chairman of the Board of Directors absolutely turned it into ridicule; the Governor of Madras himself, surrounded by his counsel, and with all the machinery of Government at his command, emphatically declared his disbelief. Nevertheless, a few weeks of the very simplest in-

quiry,—a few queries addressed to the local functionaries,—a brief notification circulated through the villages, sufficed to bring out the fact, that, except the authorities in question, there was hardly a soul in India who was not thoroughly cognisant of the existence of these practices! One of the officers expresses his ‘astonishment that the prevalence of torture should even ‘have been called in question;’* and the Commissioners themselves report that ‘no impartial mind could arrive at any other ‘conclusion!’†

How are we to account for this singular contrast between official darkness and unofficial notoriety? Surely the Government entrusted with the charge of untold millions of a race so utterly helpless and unfriended, has need of more perspicacity than such a contrast would appear to imply.

It may be attempted to shift the responsibility of these cruelties from the European officials charged with the collection of revenue, and to ascribe it exclusively to the native subordinates. The Commissioners themselves disclaim all intention ‘of casting any unfounded imputation either upon the Government, or its European officers.’‡ They even report (and the evidence goes far to support their representation) that ‘the ill ‘treatment is as much, perhaps more commonly, resorted to by ‘the native officials *for the extortion of their own illicit demands,* ‘as for the extraction of the dregs of the revenue.’ Many of the cases which came before them ‘exhibited the practice of ‘oppression applied for the gratification of private passions, ‘whether of avarice or revenge; the calendars exhibit repeated ‘instances of the same character; and the evil lies even deeper ‘than the level of the public revenue, though the renewal of demands for old balances and outstandings on account of Government, is usually made the cloak under which such acts of oppression are concealed;’ they add that many witnesses declared to them, that ‘the people would be satisfied if the demands of ‘the revenue officers were restricted to the just Government ‘dues;’ and they are perfectly satisfied, that it is in the exaction of these unlawful gains that the use of torture is most common. It is in such cases that,

‘The perfect but silent machinery which combines the forces of revenue demands and police authority is brought into play; the most ingenious artifices which the subtlety of the native mind can invent are had recourse to; and it seems highly probable that it is a common practice with the native officials *to give their own illicit demands precedence,* when, pecuniary means being more plentiful or more

Report, p. 13.

† Ibid. p. 45.

‡ Ibid. p. 51.

easily procurable, the process of extraction is more easily complied with, under hopes and promises of future services, perhaps that of assisting in cheating Government among others;—expressly with a view to keep the revenue demands as a *corps de reserve* to fall back upon, the practice of oppression and violence to extract that not being so apparent an injustice in the eyes of the people as the application of the same measures for mere private or personal purposes.' (*Report*, p. 47.)

Upon these and similar grounds the Commissioners are disposed to acquit the European officers of the Indian Government of all connivance or complicity in these odious practices.

'We think,' they report, 'that the Service is entitled to the fullest credit for its disclaimer of all countenance of the cruel practices which prevail in the revenue, as well as in the police department. We see no reason to doubt that the native officials, from the highest to the lowest, are well aware of the disposition of their European superiors; and, although very many of the parties who have appeared before us, in reply to our inquiry why they have not made an earlier complaint, have asked, "What is the use of appealing to the collectors;" we have seen nothing to impress us with the belief that the people, at large entertain the idea that their maltreatment is countenanced or tolerated by the European officers of government. On the contrary, all they seem to desire is, that the Europeans, in their respective districts, should themselves take up and investigate complaints brought before them. The distances which the natives will travel, at great personal loss and inconvenience, to make complaints even of a very petty nature, to the collector or sub-collector, is of itself a proof of the confidence which they place generally in those officers. The abstinence of the native officials from those practices in or near the stations where Europeans, be they civilians, surgeons, commissariat, or other officers, reside, and the prevalence of torture increasing in proportion as the talook appears less exposed to European scrutiny, are strong arguments in favour of a consciousness on the part of the native officials that they cannot with impunity resort to illegal or personal violence, when it admits of easy and speedy substantiation before the European authorities of the district; and the whole cry of the people that has come up before us, has been to *save them from the cruelties of their fellow natives*, not from unkindness or indifference on the part of the European officers of Government.' (*Report*, p. 51, 52.)

Now, although there is considerable truth in a part of the view of the evidence here put forward, and although we can easily understand and sympathise with the natural reluctance of the Commissioners to condemn, in a matter which concerns the very best and most sacred feelings of humanity, so large and so respectable a body as the Civil Service of India, yet we are bound to say, that, while we are far from impeaching the honourable and

humane dispositions of the whole body, or even of any very large section of the body, we feel, nevertheless, that the case, as against them, is far more formidable than it is represented in the lenient, we might almost say laudatory, paragraph just cited. Enough is casually conveyed, even in the cases referred to in this paper, to show that there prevails a general distrust, if not worse than distrust, of the fairness of the European authorities in matters of dispute between the ryots and their natural enemies, the native revenue officials; and we must add, that, even on the showing of the Commissioners themselves, not only were many cases brought before them in which the parties had been deterred from making an earlier complaint, because 'there was no use in appealing to the collector,' but there were many other cases in which, as we shall see, complaints, often of a very serious nature (involving, in some instances, capital charges), had actually been made to collectors, sub-collectors, judges, magistrates, and other European functionaries, and had been treated by them either with indifference or with positive disregard. For our part, we have risen from the perusal of the evidence with an impression as to the feelings entertained by the natives in reference to their chances of justice at the hands of the European officers, precisely the opposite of that stated in the Report.

And, after all, even though we were to concede the full extent of this plea set up for the European officials, the ultimate responsibility of these reprehensible practices would only be shifted back one degree further. It is plain that the Government cannot get rid of the general responsibility which attaches to the instruments whom it employs. When the Government entrusts to hands so confessedly unclean as those of its native officials, a function so important, so delicate, so full of temptation, and so open to abuse, it is clearly responsible, if not for each individual act of these officials, at least for such general supervision of their conduct as will render malversation difficult, ready of detection, and easy of redress. And if, on the contrary, it be found that the European officers entrusted with this immediate supervision have, in very many instances, proved themselves either scandalously remiss in searching out abuse, or criminally cognisant of its existence; if they have made the British name, among the native population, not the defence of the weak and the avenger of violated right, but the inspirer of oppression and the shield of the evil-doer; if, in a word, they have created a deep and wide-spread conviction, that, whatever may be the letter of the law, practically there is no redress for its very worst violation; and if, now, when the crisis comes, it

is content to rest its defence on professions of surprise, ignorance, incredulity, and positive disbelief, are we not entitled to refuse to it the benefit of such disclaimers, and to hold it convicted of having, for the long series of years during which this wrong has endured, criminally failed in what is the first and most vital function of Government—the protection of the persons, the property, and the rights of the subjects?

Now what, even as they appear in this official volume, are the facts of this unhappy case? From many incidental allusions, in the statements noticed in the course of this article, it will be seen that redress has often been refused, even when demanded from the English officials. Not to speak of minor authorities, in at least two cases which we have cited, the complainant was repulsed by the English collector himself. In one of these, a case of great barbarity, the poor wretch was cruelly told, that, if he had paid his land-tax, he would have escaped the infliction; in the other case, in which death appears to have occurred in consequence of the excessive severity of the torture, the collector simply said, ‘that he had nothing to do with it,’ and referred the complainant to the sub-collector; and the sub-collector, in his turn, declined to entertain the complaint, because ‘the tahsildar (*who, be it observed, was the accused party*) had not ‘reported the circumstance to him!’ No wonder that, in making their statement before the Commission, the baffled sufferers generally confess that they ‘did not complain to the gentlemen; for ‘who will listen to a poor man?’—no wonder that they ‘did not ‘appeal to the higher authorities,’ lest they should be sent back by them to the very parties by whom they had been aggrieved!

Indeed, the general character of the complaints embodied in the Appendix is simply this;—either the parties had abstained from complaining, under the disheartening belief that redress was hopeless; or, having ventured, against hope, to prefer the complaint, they met with silence, neglect, or positive repulse!

Thus Venkiah, a ryot already referred to, sent his statement several times to the sub-collector at Ramayaputane, ‘but no ‘inquiry was made.’* Mooneappa Moodelly and three others complained to the magistrate and offered proof of their having been tortured, ‘but got no redress.’† Nullandy Naik mentioned to the judge that he had been tortured, ‘but no notice was ‘taken.’‡ Iyah Pillay ‘did not complain to the higher authorities, ‘lest he should be sent back to the tahsildar.’§ Ackiwany Appannah, having once addressed the collector in vain, declined

* App. E. 20. p. xxiv.

† App. E. 40. xlx.

‡ App. E. 42. p. l.

§ App. F. 20. cxiv.

to do so a second time, because his former petition had not been noticed.* In a word, so deeply rooted is the conviction of the hopelessness of redress, that, as if justifying the view which we have suggested, the 'petition of above forty headmen and 'ryots of Patamata,' only seems to express the universal feeling of native India, when it declares that, 'whereas they see no redress obtained for their grievances laid open to the higher authorities, they are led to conclude that *these wicked deeds must have been ordered by the Government itself*, and they are 'at a loss to think what to do and where to go away.'† We must confess that, at least in many of the reported cases, it would seem difficult to arrive at any other conclusion.

And all this, be it recollected, while the law prohibiting all such practices (although certainly not summary enough in the redress which it affords), is most clear and explicit in its prohibitions; while every such interference with the person or property of the subject is a punishable offence in India, as it is in England! The real grievance, although, as the Commissioners themselves assert, partly traceable to the want of summary process, lies in the obstacles which a corrupt, defective, and ill-administered executive system throws in the way of obtaining redress.

The point which strikes us first and most painfully is, on the one hand, the pettiness of the sums for the exaction of which these execrable means are adopted, and, on the other, the shameful inadequacy of the penalty inflicted by the magistrates in the rare cases in which convictions are obtained against officials charged with this unlawful violence.

Thus we find an unfortunate man, Nangun Chalooovun, subjected to the anundal, tortured with the kittee, and exposed to the burning sun during four hours, in order to compel payment of an illegal demand of *ten annas* (fifteen pence)! Another Ryot, named Singuriah, who refused to pay the sum of *one rupee four annas* (two shillings and sixpence), had his hands tied behind his back and his head bound down to his feet with a coir rope, for two hours.‡ Nay, in the terrible case of Vencatachella Rajaulee, in which one of the parties actually died from the effects of the violence employed, the sum demanded was *but ten rupees*!§

On the other hand the Commissioners themselves, notwithstanding their unwillingness to cast any imputation on the European officials (who alone may in practice be said to be con-

* App. F. 20. p. cxxi.

† App. F. 29. p. cxxx-i.

‡ App. E. 7.

§ App. E. 15.

cerned with judicial decisions), express their astonishment at 'the extraordinary lightness of the punishment generally awarded in those instances in which the charge has been held to be proved.*' Judging from the tabular returns collected by them, a fine of a few rupees, which may be commuted into a brief imprisonment, would appear to be the ordinary sentence. It is generally thought enough to inflict a fine equivalent in amount to the sum extorted. In case 12. of the Coimbatore Calendar †, the monigar and four subordinates, having been convicted before the English assistant-magistrate of extorting revenue by maltreatment and violence, were merely fined; the monigar and two of his subordinates each four rupees (eight shillings), and the other two subordinates, two rupees each! The same magistrate, in a case in which the monigar was convicted of having by the same species of violence extorted fifty rupees from his accuser, contented himself with imposing on the culprit a fine equivalent in amount to the sum which he had extorted. In another similar case he inflicted a fine of ten rupees! § And (although it is not noticed by the Commissioners) the strangest circumstance connected with these cases is, that *this very magistrate*, whose name is Moreton John Walhouse, Esq., in his official reply to the queries put forth by the Governor in Council, pronounces, as the result of his own experience, that 'the statements of the speeches circulated by the Government are *pure fiction*, at least as regards his own district'! § Surely such facts as these are sufficient to create grave suspicion.

It is gratifying, however, to find that this scandalous laxity is not universal.

Mr. Daniell, the Government agent in Kurnool, reports an instance in which an amildar convicted of extorting revenue by violence, 'was sentenced to seven years' imprisonment with 'hard labour in irons.' In the Nellore calendar, several prisoners, convicted of these violences before Mr. Minchin, appear sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour for various periods, according to the degree of violence employed. A tahsildar, convicted of subjecting Ackinany Appannah to the torture of the kittee so lately as the middle of 1854, was sentenced to six months' hard labour in irons. Another exercise of this salutary rigour recorded by the Commissioners, has acquired a touching interest since the publication of their Report, from the melancholy fate of the excellent officer to whom it is ascribed, Mr.

* Report, p. 41.

† App. H. 14.

‡ App. H. 14.

§ App. C. 19. p. clxxxiv.

Connolly, the collector of Malabar. The last mail brought intelligence that, as he was seated with his wife in the verandah of his house, five men, armed with the long Moplah knife, rushed upon him; and, although the servants, summoned by the cries of his wife, came to his rescue, they were kept at bay by the assassins till the deed of blood had been accomplished, when the murderers fled, leaving the body of their victim almost literally hacked to pieces, no less than twenty-seven wounds having been found upon it! We have alluded to the melancholy fate of this lamented officer chiefly for the purpose, not only of disconnecting his fate from the discontents arising out of the revenue system, but also of freeing his memory from all suspicion of complicity in the obnoxious practices of the native officials. The Commissioners report, that the districts of Malabar and Canara present a remarkable contrast in this respect to almost all the other collectorates of the Presidency. In Malabar, torture for revenue purposes is entirely unknown; and although traces of its use for police purposes still linger in the district, the ill-fated collector, Mr. Connolly, had been most active and energetic in repressing the practice and punishing the offenders. A peon, who, in 1843 (long before this agitation had been thought of), had ill-treated a prisoner so as to lead him to attempt suicide, was sentenced by Mr. Connolly to two years' imprisonment and hard labour. Several similar instances of rigour are related in the Report which he addressed to the Commission; and its closing sentence expresses a hope 'that the determination which has been shown to pass no case by in which torture could even be presumed, has not been without its effect.'*

We regret, however, to say, that magistrates such as Mr. Daniell, Mr. Minchin, and Mr. Connolly, are the exception; the rule is such as might be presumed from the instances cited in a former page; and the tabular reports furnished by the judges throughout the various districts, almost invariably present the same general character as that from which the above statements are extracted.

Now while the administrators of justice are known to act by such a standard, it is idle to hope, no matter how rigorous may be the terms of the law and how stringent its prohibitions, that it can serve either as a restraint upon the evil-doer, or a source of confidence to the aggrieved. It is idle to think that the native population can ever look even to the European representatives of the Government, as to protectors against wrong,

or avengers of violated liberty. It is idle to expect that from such a state of things, any other feeling can result than that so frequently and so plaintively expressed, 'what is the use of a 'poor man like me complaining?' It is idle, in fine, to look for any other estimate of the real relations between the European officials and the native subordinates on whom the rough work of collection devolves, than the one contained in the statement of Naugun Chaloovum;—that '*because the kurnom has to pay money to those above him, they will not inquire into his exaction.*'* Nor can any right-minded man dissent from the conclusion of the Commissioners (although it goes far to neutralise their own favourable report on the conduct and character of the European servants of the East Indian Government), that 'the great proportion of the acquittals, and the 'lightness of the punishments consequent on such cases as 'appear to have been substantiated to the satisfaction of the 'magistracy, may have had a serious effect in deterring the 'ryots from bringing forward more numerous complaints.'

We are the more earnest in insisting upon the broad truth in this particular, and in tearing away the disguises under which a false consideration for the honour of the Service naturally seeks to conceal it, because we know this to be an old and inveterate evil which no gentle palliative can cure. It is now thirty years since the very same evils, in precisely the same form, were brought under the notice of the Court of Directors. In a Report of one of the circuit judges, contained in the Directors' Judicial Letter of April 16th, 1826, it is declared that 'there is hardly a case wherein the sufferers who have 'had the courage, or have been in the circumstances, to 'complain against the oppressors, have met with redress of 'their grievances, and in which the accused have not been 'sent back to the situations which they have so grossly 'abused, and thereby encouraged to renew their excesses 'by the facility they experience in escaping justice.' It is further stated that, 'in most of these complaints, when the 'judge on circuit has read over the record of the proceedings, 'even that kept by the magistrates themselves, he has discovered that all, with hardly an exception, have been dismissed 'as "not proved or groundless," although the evidence in most is 'such as not to leave a doubt that considerable personal violence 'had been done by the parbuttees and the kolkars to the complainants.'† In 1826, as in 1855, these practices were punishable by the criminal law of India; then, as now, the administra-

* P. 25.

† P. 53.

tion of that law was proved to be grossly abused. The Court of Directors of that period recorded their reprobation of such practices; but the calendars appended to the Report before us, prove beyond all question that the very same abuses are still in existence, and that the law, whatever its theoretical value, is still practically a dead letter. In all these hateful cases, impunity for malpractices in the collection of revenue by the native officers is still the normal condition of the criminal courts of Southern India. If we would hope to see an effectual remedy, it must be sought at other and more energetic hands.

It is confessed that the native official body is corrupt and oppressive to the people, and that the only check on their evil doings lies in European supervision. But it is equally confessed that this supervision of the Europeans is, after all, impossible.

And, in truth, how could it be otherwise? The enormous extent of territory, and the vast and widely scattered population assigned to each district, render utterly hopeless that personal supervision on the part of the magistrate, by which alone an efficient check can be maintained over an extensive and powerful confederation for corrupt practices, such as that which is reported to exist in the native official service of India. Mr. Cherry, of the Salem district, describes himself, as the sole European to overlook the police duties among a population of no less than 572,860, and to supervise the collection of revenue in a territory of 4000 square miles.* The district of North Arcot, which is said to be a fair average in both these respects, contains 7000 square miles, with a population of very nearly a million and a half: but the total number of European officers in this enormous district is six! Vizigapatam, with an area of 7,650 square miles, and a population of 1,254,272, has but four European officers. Bellary and Cuddapah, the area of each of which is about 13,000 square miles, have each but the same miserably disproportioned staff—six European officers. Only imagine Wales (although this is far from an adequate illustration of the disproportion), with but four resident magistrates throughout its entire extent. Long before the existence of Thuggee was known or suspected by the British officials, not only were all the details of it familiar to the native officers of the Government, but the native Chief of the Police Establishment at Delhi was *himself the head of a gang of Thugs*, and this fact was perfectly well known to his native colleagues and subordinates, not one of whom thought proper to denounce

* App. C. p. cxlii.

him! So little is really known by the handful of Europeans scattered over India of the morality and real character of those with whom they are brought into daily contact.

It is easier, however, to detail these evils, numerous as they unhappily are, than to suggest any practical and effective remedial measures. The system is not of recent origin, nor the growth of any new circumstances arising upon the change of masters in India. It is a part, unfortunately, of the heritage which we have received from the various native governments which we have replaced throughout the peninsula; and, although the present inquiry has had reference only to Madras, and has therefore only dealt with the form of land tenure which prevails there—the ryotwarry, it would be a too flattering inference to conclude that the other presidencies of India are exempt from the same abuses, or that the collection of the land-tax under the zemindarry and village systems is immaculate. This will, no doubt, furnish matter for further inquiry. Meanwhile it is only justice to state that the Madras Commissioners have clearly shown that the abuses which still covertly maintain themselves under British rule in the revenue administration, and in despite of the law, are mercy itself when compared with what formed, and indeed still forms, the unconcealed organisation for the same purpose under some of the native governments. Murshid Aly Khan, who became Nawab of Bengal in 1718, used to array the defaulting zemindars in long, loose, leather drawers *filled with live cats!* A more gentle and slower, but hardly less effective expedient employed by him, was to make them drink buffalo's milk mixed with salt, 'till they were brought to death's door by 'diarrhœa.' The chora, or whip, was plied unceasingly. Hanging up by the feet with the head downwards, bastinadoing, immersing in water, exposing naked to the broiling sun, were the most common practices; varied occasionally 'by tying to a 'palm tree and 'smearing with honey, in order to attract the 'red ants!' One of the agents of this tyrant, adding mockery to cruelty, had a pond prepared for the special torture of the Hindoos, calling it in derision Bickout (Paradise), which he ordered to be filled with every most disgusting substance, and through which defaulters were dragged by a rope passed under their arms, till they yielded to his demands.*

The same or similar practices existed and still exist in the other provinces of India. In the kingdom of Oude, the process of collecting the land-tax in the several districts, is like the invasion of a hostile army. Even in British India itself, (strange

* Chéver's Report on Medical Jurisprudence in Bengal, p. 306.

and painful as are the ideas which such an admission must suggest,) the native population have come, by a long tradition of moral debasement, to regard a certain degree of compulsion as the normal condition of the collection of the public revenue. All the witnesses, native as well as European, are unanimous in attesting the existence of such a feeling among the ryots. The Commissioners confess that 'the infliction of such descriptions of treatment as they had described, has come, in the course of centuries, to be looked on as customary—a thing of course, and to be submitted to as an every-day unavoidable necessity;' and the vernacular phrase, '*Mamool*,' (customary) by which the natives describe it, is the most painful evidence which could be offered of its universality. Corporal punishment, in truth, is one of the established 'institutions' of India. Masters use it, as a matter of course, to their servants, parents to their children, all superiors to their inferiors. It excites no surprise, and hardly seems to provoke the indignation of the sufferer himself, must less of the bystander. Perhaps the most characteristic illustration of the popular feeling as to its use in the collection of the revenue, is the curious fact alluded to by the Commissioners, that, in the rude dramas of the populace, a favourite scene, and one which never fails to be received with shouts of laughter, is 'the exhibition of Revenue squeezed out of a defaulter coin by coin, through the appliance of familiar provocatives,' under the superintendence of a caricatured '*tahsildar*.* Mr. Mackenzie, a merchant of Bimlipatam, declares his belief that 'no laws can eradicate the practice: it has existed from time immemorial; the natives in general think it all right, and in order to get rid of it the very nature of the people must first be changed.' Many of the witnesses, too, concur in stating that the ryots, in general, appear to expect this violence as a part of the process of collection, and that they prepare themselves accordingly. 'I brought the money,' says a ryot referred to by Mr. Lushington †, 'but as no violence was used towards me, I did not pay.' The ryot will often come to the *cutcherry*, as we learn from another officer §, with the full amount of his kist in his possession, tied up in small sums in different parts of his dress, prepared to dole it out, rupee by rupee, and ana by ana, according to the degree of urgency employed; and will sometimes go away leaving a balance unpaid, simply because he was not forced to pay it.

* Report, p. 50.

† App. C. p. xlvii.

‡ App. C. iv.

§ Mr. Forbes, collector of Tanjore. App. C. xvi.

We think it right to dwell upon this strange, and to our ideas inexplicable state of feeling, in order to make it clear that at least the introduction of such practices is not chargeable upon British rule in India. On the contrary, from the very date of our occupation of this country they have been prohibited by stringent and repeated enactments, and their clandestine maintenance in despite of the law is undoubtedly to be ascribed in part to the passive and unmanly condition of public feeling in the native population. But while we admit the validity of this wretched plea to the fullest extent to which it can be urged, we must not shut our eyes to the important question how far we are ourselves responsible for the continuance of abuses arising out of a barbarous government and a degraded state of society. How long could such a state of feeling have held its ground under an honest, vigorous, and systematic course of administration, directed against the evils in which this feeling originated?

- ART. VII. — 1. *Despatches of Captain M'Clure during the Voyage of H. M. S. 'Investigator' to the Polar Seas.* 1850-1854. (Arctic Papers, presented to Parliament, 1855.)
2. *A Series of Eight Sketches in Colour, together with a Chart of the Route of the Voyage of H. M. S. 'Investigator' during the Discovery of the North West Passage.* By Lieutenant GURNEY CRESSWELL, R. N. London: 1854.
3. *The Last of the Arctic Voyages.* By Captain Sir EDWARD BELCHER, R. N. 2 vols. London: 1855.
4. *Narrative of Arctic Discovery; from the Earliest Period to the Present Time.* By T. C. SMITH-LINGLAW, F.R.G.S.

HAD the voyage of H. M. S. 'Investigator' taken place five and twenty years ago, a nation's applause would have greeted its completion, and honour and emolument at once been showered on the dauntless captain and the sturdy crew who have solved the question of centuries, and accomplished in their own persons the long-sought North-west Passage. It is at present more as an example of human endurance and of unshaken perseverance, that the voyage of the 'Investigator' excites our curiosity and our interest.

Three hundred years have elapsed since John Cabot and his son Sebastian set forth in search of a North-west Passage, through unexplored seas; and not long afterwards, Sir Hugh Willoughby and his ship's company, after vainly attempting to

make their way to the eastward, were found by some Russian fishermen, a frozen monument to the severity of the climate. Two centuries and a half have passed since Frobisher's ships dropped down the river, past the palace of Greenwich, where amid the salutes of artillery, the Maiden Queen waved her hand, in token of good wishes, to the departing voyagers. In Mr. Shillinglaw's book a succinct statement of these and other unavailing attempts is to be found; nor, as a hand-book for Arctic adventure and discovery, can anything be more useful or accurate than his unpretending little volume. Except the voyage of the Russian navigator Behring, in 1741, for above a hundred years little more was attempted in exploring these Northern Seas. But early in the reign of George III. interest in the subject was again awakened in England, and in 1773 an expedition was sent forth under Captain Constantine John Phipps. Lord Nelson, then a youngster, served in one of these vessels. This attempt to the North-west entirely failing, Captain Cook was chosen for the endeavour to effect a north-east passage, from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean. This gallant navigator left Plymouth Sound July 1776, and by August in the year following had struggled on to Icy Cape, from that time till the voyage of Admiral Beechy the furthest boundary of North-eastern discovery.

Again fifty years passed without any further attempt, till Sir John Ross followed by way of Davis Straits and Baffin's Bay. He sailed from the Thames in April 1818, and returned in October, having scarcely effected anything. His young lieutenant, Parry, who could never be made to understand why his chief turned back at the entrance to Sir James Lancaster's Sound, took up the enterprise. Captain Parry, in command of the 'Hecla' and 'Griper,' left England May 1819. On the 4th of September, this expedition having crossed the meridian of 110° west from Greenwich, in the lat. of $74^{\circ} 44' 20''$, the crews became entitled to the Government reward of 5000*l*. Captain Parry pushed on till the 8th, when in lat. $74^{\circ} 26' N.$, long. $113^{\circ} 47' W.$, his further course was arrested by an immovable body of ice. But it was here that the coast of Banks's Land was first seen across the strait which divides it from Melville Island. To this point, 'Parry's furthest,' as it is now termed, we would especially direct attention. A quarter of a century was to elapse before that ice-bound strait should be again visited, and then from an opposite quarter of the globe. The following season, finding further progress impossible, Parry returned to England.

In the same year (1819) Franklin undertook his terrible

journey to the northern shores of America. He was three years absent, having, with the intrepid Back and his faithful companion Richardson, travelled between five and six thousand miles, and endured unparalleled hardships. But he returned to England, having established the existence of an Arctic Ocean, into which fall the Coppermine and Mackenzie Rivers, but which is apparently impassable for all purposes of navigation.

From that time the task of Arctic discovery rested till 1845, when, mainly under the auspices of the late Sir John Barrow, another expedition was resolved on by the Admiralty. It was thought that neither as a nautical nor as a scientific matter, did it become the English navy thus to leave the question, whether the great Pacific and Atlantic Oceans were united or not by a polar or arctic sea, extending along the whole breadth of North America; and although the sterile and hopeless nature of these voyages had long been ascertained, they seemed to have acquired a fascinating power over those who projected or engaged in them, which was heightened by the contest with almost insuperable obstacles. A long peace had closed almost every avenue to fame or promotion. At that time, great credit was attached to the endurance of Arctic voyagers, and no sooner was it known that such an expedition was contemplated, than volunteers pressed forwards, eager for employment. The gallant veteran, Sir John Franklin, undertook the command. The 'Erebus' and 'Terror' left England in 1845. No two ships ever quitted our shores whose history or whose fate has so much arrested public attention. Nearly thirty vessels, of various sizes and descriptions, fitted out by public or by private means in England or America, have been sent forth in search of them. In 1848, the third year of their absence, three separate expeditions were planned by Government. One for Behring's Straits, under Kellett and Moore; the course proposed being, that whilst the 'Plover' and 'Herald' were securely placed for the winter, whaling boats should pursue the search along the coast of America. Another party, under Sir John Richardson, was to proceed by way of the Hudson's Bay settlements, to examine the shore between the Mackenzie and Coppermine Rivers. The third, and to this the chief importance was attached, was to consist of two vessels, in every possible way strengthened, prepared, and provisioned, to pursue the route through Lancaster's Sound, Barrow's Straits, and then push to the westward.

The 'Enterprise,' 470 tons, and the 'Investigator,' 460 tons, were the vessels chosen for this purpose. They left England, June 12th, 1848, under the command of Captain Sir James

Clark Ross; they wintered in Port Leopold, at the entrance of Prince Regent's Inlet. Little travelling, compared with later expeditions, was attempted, one journey excepted, by Captain Ross himself, reaching lat. $72^{\circ} 38' N.$, and long. $95^{\circ} 40' W.$ The health of the men suffered greatly from the bad and offensive nature of some of the preserved food supplied to them. On the 1st of September, 1849, shortly after leaving winter quarters, the vessels became involved in a vast field of consolidated ice, to the north of Barrow's Straits, in which they remained for three weeks, drifting in utter helplessness. Then suddenly their icy prison opened, the huge field was split into innumerable fragments, the adventurers regained the open sea, and on the 5th of November the ships reached England. Bitter was the disappointment through the length and breadth of the land to find that so little had been accomplished, and no tidings brought home of the fate of our missing countrymen. Immediate preparations were made for renewed exertions. The 'Enterprise' and 'Investigator' were again put in commission, and every possible means employed, to hasten their preparation. The command of the expedition was entrusted to Captain Richard Collinson; but this time a far different route was to be attempted. Captain Collinson's orders were to pass through the Straits of Magellan, refresh at the Sandwich Islands, push on for Behring's Straits, and after passing them, bear away to the eastward for Banks's Land and Melville Island. Commander McClure, late first lieutenant of the 'Enterprise,' was appointed to command the second ship.

Hardy in frame, resolute of purpose, no one could have been selected more likely to wrest success from the most adverse circumstances. Robert John Le Mesurier McClure, the future discoverer of the North-west Passage, was born at Wexford, the residence of his maternal grandfather, archdeacon Elgee, January 28th, 1807, some months after the death of his father, Captain McClure of the 89th regiment. He went, first to Eton College, and then to Sandhurst; but military life was distasteful to him, and he entered the navy when about seventeen years of age. He had been twelve years afloat, generally in active service, when, in 1836, he volunteered to join Captain (now Sir George) Back's expedition, in the attempt to reach Repulse Bay. On his return from that perilous voyage, in the autumn of the year following, he obtained his lieutenancy, and shortly afterwards served in the 'Hastings,' employed to convey Lord Durham to his Colonial Government. In Canada, he joined an expedition against a noted freebooter of the name of Kelly, for whose capture Government had offered a

large reward. The robber chief was taken, and his well-defended fort burned to the ground. Lieutenant M'Clure was afterwards placed in command of the 'Romney,' receiving ship at the Havanna, and subsequently employed in the Coast Guard at home. On the first rumours of Sir James Ross's appointment to the command of an expedition in search of Sir John Franklin in 1848, M'Clure offered his services, and was appointed first lieutenant of the 'Enterprise.'

The 'Enterprise' and 'Investigator' left Woolwich for the second time, January 10th, 1850, and sailed from Plymouth on the 20th of the same month. On the 27th the 'Investigator,' a slower vessel than the 'Enterprise,' lost sight of her consort, nor did they meet again till the 16th of April in the Straits of Magellan. H. M. Steam ship 'Gorgon,' Commander Painter, awaited their arrival there, to tow them through the Straits. After casting off the 'Enterprise,' which immediately pursued her way for the Sandwich Islands, the 'Gorgon' returned to assist the 'Investigator.' At the Sandwich Islands, Commander M'Clure had the mortification to find that the 'Enterprise' had sailed from Honolulu twenty-four hours before his arrival. Ably assisted by Captain Auldham, then senior officer upon that station, in obtaining needful stores and fresh provisions, the 'Investigator' was ready again for sea on the 4th of July, three days after casting anchor in Honolulu harbour.

Captain Collinson's instructions, left for Commander M'Clure, dated Oahu, June 29th, were to follow him as soon as possible to Cape Lisburne, and thence, if he had no further orders or directions, to press forward as circumstances might permit to the north-east in the direction of Melville Island. And here we meet with the first link in the remarkable chain of favourable coincidences to be traced in the 'Investigator's' story. A few hours before her departure from the Sandwich Islands, the 'Cockatrice' came in with letters and despatches from England. She brought all the parliamentary papers affecting the researches for Sir John Franklin, and also the information, that an expedition under Captain Austin was to leave England in the spring of that year for Lancaster's Sound and Barrow's Straits. The orders to Captain Austin not only directed searches for the 'Erebus' and 'Terror' to the west and north-west, but especially mentioned Melville Island. To meet their brother adventurers midway in the frozen north, or to pass them in the race, and crossing their track accomplish the route to England by the north-east, became now the object of intense excitement amongst the 'Investigators'; but the season was already far advanced, Captain Collinson was ahead of them, and would

probably have entered the ice long before they could overtake him, as he had a much better sailing vessel, and four days' start from Honolulu.

Another singular circumstance now occurred. The captain of an American whaler fell in with Commander M'Clure. This man had long navigated those seas, and he counselled Commander M'Clure, instead of following the usual track to about 170° W. long., which Captain Collinson had taken, to make a straight course for Behring's Straits, passing through the Aleutian group of islands. To a prompt and daring spirit as Commander M'Clure's, to hear was to decide; and on the 4th of July he left Honolulu, with a stiff breeze in the desired quarter. Twenty-five days and nights the wind blew steadily, scarcely varying a point, till on the 30th of July the 'Investigator' was off Cape Lisburne, — Behring's Straits, and the Aleutian Islands, with their fogs and shoals behind her, — and the ice-world, whither she was hastening, visible from her mast-head. So wonderful and successful a run scarcely stands on record. The spirits of all on board rose. 'I would not change places with any man in Europe,' wrote one young officer to his friends in England. 'You may yet hear of our doing some thing,' said another. The men shared in the enthusiasm of their officers, and we find them a few days later accompanying their work with cheers and singing, when employed for six successive hours in towing the vessel through a sea heavily encumbered with broken ice. At Cape Lisburne they parted company with the 'Herald' Captain Kellett, after confiding to his care their farewell letters for England. Captain Kellett, as senior officer, shrank from the responsibility of allowing a single ship to enter on so dangerous a service. With a consort, in case of accidents, there is a chance of succour or escape; but the risk seemed too fearful, for a solitary vessel to attempt the navigation of seas wholly unknown and unexplored by civilised man. Boat expeditions had made their way in various directions along the shores of North America; but Captain Pullen and other experienced officers believed that for any larger vessel the navigation was impossible. To the North lay the unbroken polar track; to the South, the coast of North America, abounding in shoals and inlets, rocks and sand banks, and except for a few weeks in summer studied with drifting floes, besides the perpetual formation of young ice, driven about by currents or prevailing winds. Such was the navigation before them; nor is it wonderful that Captain Kellett hesitated and would fain have persuaded M'Clure to forego the risk. M'Clure pleaded his own Com-

mander's orders, the urgency of the case, and added his determination to proceed unless directly prohibited by his senior officer, on whom, and on whom alone, the responsibility should rest. Captain Kellett withdrew his veto, and under a press of canvass, the 'Investigator' bore away to the North-west. This experienced Arctic voyager knew but too well the possible doom awaiting her: again his resolution wavered, and from the mast-head of the 'Herald' the signal for recall was hoisted, but the moment was past, and he had for answer, 'duty special,'—'own responsibility,'—'cannot return.'

To the Admiralty Commander M'Clure wrote, that in accordance with the directions given him, his endeavour would be to force a way to the North-east, and so reach Bank's Land. After examining its shores, to proceed to Melville Island, and continue the search there. He knew that Captain Austin's expedition was enjoined to go to Melville Island; moreover, that this island was considered the most advanced point of Arctic geography, terminating Barrow's Straits, and opening to the North-west on the still unexplored regions which lay beyond it. On the 5th of August the 'Investigator' changed numbers with the 'Plover,' and here fairly her voyage of discovery began. All known places and things left behind them, Commander M'Clure and his crew had of human help but themselves, and of outward means but their own well-provided ship for strength or assistance. But they were employed in a noble work,—to seek and to succour their lost countrymen; their health was excellent, their courage high; one spirit pervaded captain, officers, and men; and above all, the most careless could not but acknowledge that a guiding hand had hitherto been so eminently with them, that they might confide their future in trust and hope to its care.

The 'Investigator's' course from that time along the northern shores of America was a continued struggle against every variety of obstacle: occasionally sailing for a few miles through open water; then steering a narrow and perilous track between the ice-floes and the coast, the shoal water endangering her grounding at one moment, and at another the fearful polar pack apparently settling down upon her and driving her on the land. Then again from time to time beguiled by an opening in the pack, Commander M'Clure flattered himself that their way was clear, and that by pursuing a north-easterly course, they might attain the Bank's Land of Parry, or the north of Melville Island. But in this attempt they ever failed; for however far the opening led them, in one instance above seventy miles, it was found at last

to be but a *cul-de-sac* of larger dimensions. Every heap of stones or apparent signal post was examined; continued intercourse was kept up with the Esquimaux, and through Mr. Miertsching, their excellent interpreter, inquiries the most searching instituted as to any white men having been seen or heard of. They bartered trifles with the natives, sometimes for ducks and salmon; and on more than one occasion entrusted letters to their care, hoping that some document through the Hudson's Bay Company settlements might reach England and tell of their whereabouts. Yet with all these impediments they continued to make way, and on the 6th of September had traversed upwards of 600 miles, and were approaching the longitude of Melville Island. But here we will let Commander M'Clure, in his despatch to the Admiralty, recount his own story.

'At 4 A. M., upon the morning of the 6th, we were off the small island near Cape Parry, bearing N. E. by N. ten miles, with a fine westerly breeze, and loose sailing ice, interspersed with many heavy floe pieces; the main pack was about three miles to the N. W., apparently one solid mass. At 11.30 A. M. high land was observed on the port bow, bearing N. E. by N., distant about fifty miles. On approaching it, the main pack appeared to be resting upon the western shore, which side it was my intention to have coasted, had it been possible; the eastern one being, however, comparatively clear, as far as could be ascertained from the mast-head, decided me to follow the water, supposing it an island round which a passage would be found into the Polar Sea. We continued working to windward the whole of the night, and by 9.30 A. M. of the 7th were off the South Cape, a fine bold headland, the cliffs rising perpendicularly upwards of a thousand feet, which was named "Lord Nelson's Head," in memory of that hero, whose early career was connected with Arctic adventure. We shortly afterwards hove to, and, with the first whaleboat and cutter, landed and took possession in the name of Her Most Gracious Majesty, calling it "Baring's Island," in honour of the First Lord of the Admiralty. A pole was erected, with a large painted ball upon it, near a cask, which was left containing a notification and other particulars of our having been there. The sights obtained by artificial horizon place the signal staff in latitude $71^{\circ} 6' N.$, longitude $123^{\circ} 0' W.$; and the fall of the tide was ascertained to be six inches during one hour and a half. We observed numerous traces of reindeer, hare, and wild fowl; moss and divers species of wild flowers were also in great abundance; many specimens were of them equally as of other subjects of interest to the naturalist, selected with much care by Dr. Armstrong. From an elevation obtained of about 500 feet, we had a fine view towards the interior, which was well clothed with moss, giving a verdant appearance to the ranges of hills that rose gradually to between 2,000 and 3,000

feet, intersected with ravines which must convey a copious supply of water to a large lake situated in the centre of a wide plain, about 15 miles distant; the sight to seaward was favourable in the extreme; open water, with a very small quantity of ice, for the distance of full forty miles toward the east, insured good progress in that direction. Returning on board at 1 p. m. we made sail to the eastward, having a beating wind.'

Hairbreadth escapes and innumerable difficulties assailed them from this time until the 8th of October, when 'after a nip which lifted the vessel a foot, and heeled her forty degrees to port,' she settled into winter quarters in lat. $74^{\circ} 47'$ N., long. $110^{\circ} 48'$ W. No description can convey an idea to the reader of the stern grandeur and appalling severity of this struggle between the skill and daring of the Arctic navigators and the inexorable forces which rule that wintry ocean. We must turn to the admirable coloured sketches published from the drawings of one of the officers engaged in this expedition to enable us to form a conception of the dangers which seemed at every instant about to annihilate this frail and solitary vessel.

An adventure very characteristic of Polar travelling occurred on the 10th. Commander M'Clure, accompanied by Lieut. Gurney Cresswell, Dr. Armstrong and Mr. Miertsching, left the ship to erect a pole and take possession of Prince Albert's Land opposite Baring's Island. Anxious to extend their view, they ascended a hill about five miles off, 1500 feet in height. From this spot Commander M'Clure hoped to see the opening into Barrow's Straits, but intervening land prevented his attaining his object, and disappointed and fatigued they prepared to return. Great was their annoyance to find the ice floated from the shore, and that 100 yards of water separated it from their travelling ground. For miles they walked along the margin, falling and stumbling over broken ice. Whilst daylight remained they trusted to find some floating piece, on which to ferry across; when darkness rendered this impossible, by firing their guns they strove to attract attention, but the distance from the ship was too great for their signals to be heard. Meanwhile on board, their prolonged absence occasioned no little alarm, and parties were dispersed in various directions to seek them. About 8.30 p.m. Mr. Court, the second master, descried the flash of a gun, though when near enough to communicate, he found a broad lane of water flowing between them. On his way back for assistance, he fell in with another party bringing two of Halkett's India-rubber portable boats. With the help of these, after eighteen hours' walking without food or

shelter, the weary travellers found themselves once more on board.

The proximity to Barrow's Straits was, however, too tempting to allow of inactivity, and on the 21st of October, Commander M'Clure, with a small well-chosen party, set forth by sledge travelling to ascertain their exact position. Accidents with the sledge, and other obstacles, delayed their progress; but Captain M'Clure's own unpretending words should alone be used to describe the event which brought him within reach of the very point at which Sir Edward Parry had arrived from the opposite direction, in September 1819, and thus enabled him to complete the circuit of Arctic discovery.

'At 3.45 p. m. we had the extreme gratification of pitching our tents upon the shores of Barrow's Strait, in lat. $73^{\circ} 31' N.$, long. $114^{\circ} 39' W.$ (chronometer long. $114^{\circ} 14' \text{ lunar}$) nearly on the line, as represented in the charts, where Sir Edward Parry has very correctly marked the loom of the land. Upon the following morning, before sunrise, Mr. Court and myself ascended a small hill about 600 feet in height, so that we could command an extensive view of forty or fifty miles. The extreme point of Prince Albert's Land bore long. $78^{\circ} E.$ true, about thirty-five miles, the furthest land N.N.E. eight miles. The Melville Island shore could not be discovered, but in that direction the ice appeared to be very heavy, and the floes exceedingly large. While we were making these observations, the crew were busily engaged erecting a cairn about fifteen feet above the water (which had been named Prince of Wales Strait, in honour of his Royal Highness), in which a common cylinder was deposited. The spot is so conspicuous that any person passing along the shore must remark it.'

This feat achieved, preparations were made for winter quarters, now an old tale to English readers: the deck roofed in, sails stowed away, precautions taken to keep out the cold, winter clothes and bedding served out, and arrangements made which experience has shown to be conducive to health and comfort. To the greater part of the officers and men there was at least the charm of novelty in an Arctic winter. Not so with Commander M'Clure: besides serving as mate in Sir George (then Captain) Back's terrible voyage in the 'Terror' of 1836-37, he passed a winter and two summers in the ice with Sir James Ross, as first lieutenant of the 'Enterprise'; Lieut. Gurney Cresswell had served in that expedition as mate of the 'Investigator,' and some of the seamen had been in Sir James Ross's squadron.

The weather of that year did not prove particularly severe, and the spring of 1851 found all on board ready for spring

service. At this period the cold lessening in intensity makes travelling possible, whilst the ice retaining the hardness of winter, facilitates the draught of the sledge. Captain M'Clure's despatches contain details of the different travelling parties, their adventures and successes, but no traces of the passage of ships or of civilised man appeared in any direction. Lieut. Haswell had fallen in with Esquimaux, but obtained no information from them; Lieut. Cresswell coasted three sides of Baring's Land, but equally without success as to the main object of their voyage. Mr. Wynniatt's researches also proved unsuccessful. Without allowing for indentations of the shore, 800 miles of coast were closely though vainly examined. During their absence hunting parties had been sent forth and the ship repaired and refitted for service.

On the 14th of July 1851, the 'Investigator' was once more afloat, and recommenced her battle with the elements in the endeavour to shape a north-easterly course and force her way into Barrow's Straits. Till the 16th of August the struggle was continued with varied success, when the vessel drifted with the ice for fifteen miles to the south-west, whilst the pack could be seen extending in one unbroken line to the eastward. Under these circumstances, although twenty-five miles only from the entrance to Barrow's Strait, Captain M'Clure relinquished the attempt, and resolved upon trying it from the north-west by circumnavigating Baring's Island. We must give this part of the narrative as we find it in Captain M'Clure's despatches from the 19th to the 29th of August, the scene lying to the west and north-west of Baring's Island. It is impossible to conceive a more terrific situation.

'Upon the morning of the 19th, we passed between two small islands lying at the entrance of what appeared a deep inlet running E. S. E., and then turning sharp to the N. E. It had a barrier of ice extending across, which prevented any examination. Wishing to keep between the northernmost of these islands and the mainland, to avoid the pack which was very near it, we narrowly escaped getting on shore, as a reef extended from the latter to within half-a-mile of the island. Fortunately the wind being light, we rounded to with all the studding sails set, and let go the anchor in two-and-a-half fathoms, having about four inches to spare under the keel, and warped into four, while Mr. Court was sent to find a channel, in which he succeeded, carrying three fathoms, through which we ran for one mile, and then continued our course in eight, having from three to five miles between the ice and land. At 8 P. M. we neared two other islands, the ice resting upon the westernmost, upon which the pressure must have been excessive, as large masses were forced nearly over its summit, which was upwards of forty feet. Between

these and the main we ran through a channel in from nine to fifteen fathoms, when an immediate and marked change took place in the general appearance and formation of the land; it became high, precipitous, sterile, and rugged, intersected with deep ravines and water-courses, having sixty-five fathoms at a quarter of a mile, and fifteen fathoms a hundred yards from the cliffs, which proved exceedingly fortunate, as the whole pack, which had apparently only just broken from the shore was within half a mile, and in many places so close to it that to avoid getting beset, we had nearly to touch the land; indeed, upon several occasions the boats were compelled to be topped up, and poles used to keep the vessel off the grounded ice, which extends all along this coast; nor could we round to, fearful of carrying the jibboom away against the cliffs, which here run nearly east and west. The Cape forming its western extreme, I have called Prince Alfred, in honour of his Royal Highness. There were two apparently good harbours about twenty miles to the eastward of the Cape; the westernmost had a breakwater half-a-mile in length, twenty feet high, facing the north, with entrances on its east and west sides sixty yards in breadth; the other was circular, about three quarters of a mile in diameter, with its entrance on the west side. Our critical position would not admit of any detention, otherwise they would have been sounded, being very anxious to find a secure retreat in the event of having to winter on this coast. The weather had been fine, with a S. E. wind, which veered to the W. S. W., bringing fog and rain, so that on the morning of the 20th our further progress was impeded by finding the ice resting upon a point, which formed a slight indentation of the shore, and was the only place where water could be seen. To prevent being carried away with the pack, which was filling up its space, we secured to the inshore side of a small but heavy piece of ice, grounded in twelve fathoms, seventy-four yards from the beach, the only protection against the tremendous Polar ice (setting a knot to the eastward before a fresh westerly wind), which at 9 P. M. placed us in a very critical position, by a large floe striking the piece we were fast to, and causing it to oscillate so considerably, that a tongue, which happened to be under our bottom lifted the vessel six feet; but, by great attention to the anchors and warps, we succeeded in holding on during the conflict, which was continued several minutes, terminating by the floe being rent in pieces and our being driven nearer the beach. From this until the 29th we lay perfectly secure, but at 8 A. M. of that day, the ice began suddenly to move, when a large floe, that must have caught the piece to which we were attached under one of its overhanging ledges, *raised it perpendicular thirty feet*, presenting to all on board a frightful aspect. As it ascended above the foreyard much apprehension was felt that it might be thrown completely over, when the ship must have been crushed beneath it. This suspense was but for a few minutes, as the floe rent carrying away with it a large piece from the foundation of our asylum, when it gave several fearful rolls and resumed its former position; but no longer capable of resisting the pressure, it was hurried onward with the drifting mass. Our proxi-

mity to the shore compelled, as our only hope of safety, the absolute necessity of holding to it; we consequently secured with a chain stream and hemp cable three six and two five-inch hawsers, three of which were passed round it. In this state we were forced along, sinking large pieces beneath the bottom, and sustaining a heavy strain against the stern and rudder; the latter was much damaged, but to unship it at present was impossible. At 1 p.m. the pressure eased, from the ice becoming stationary, when it was unhung and laid upon a large floe piece, where by 8 p.m. owing to the activity of Mr. Ford the carpenter, who is always ready to meet any emergency, it was repaired, just as the ice began again to be in motion; but as the tackles were hooked it was run up to the davits without further damage. We were now setting fast upon another large piece of a broken floe, grounded in nine fathoms upon the debris formed at the mouth of a large river. Feeling certain that should we be caught between this and what we were fast to, the ship must inevitably go to pieces, and yet being aware that to cast off would certainly send us on the beach (from which we were never distant eighty yards), upon which the smaller ice was hurled as it came in contact with these grounded masses, I sent John Kerr (gunner's mate), under very difficult circumstances, to endeavour to reach it and effect its destruction by blasting; he could not, however, find a sufficient space of water to sink the charge, but remarking a large cavity upon the sea face of the floe, he fixed it there, which so far succeeded that it slightly fractured it in there, which at the moment was scarcely observable from the heavy pressure it was sustaining. By this time the vessel was within a few feet of it, and every one was on deck in anxious suspense, awaiting what was apparently the crisis of our fate; most fortunately the sternpost took it so fairly that the pressure was fore and aft, bringing the whole ship to bear. A heavy grind which shook every mast, and caused beam and decks to complain as she trembled to the violence of the shock, plainly indicated that the struggle would be but of short duration. At this moment the stream cable was carried away, and several anchors drew; thinking that we had now sufficiently risked the vessel, orders were given to let go all the warps, and with that order I had made up my mind that in a few minutes she would be on the beach, but, as it was sloping, conceived she might still prove an asylum for the winter, and possibly be again got afloat, while should she be crushed between these large grounded pieces, she must inevitably go down in ten fathoms, which would be certain destruction to all; but before the orders could be obeyed, a merciful Providence interposed, causing the ice, which had been previously weakened, to separate into three pieces, and it floated onward with the mass, our stern still tightly jammed against, but now protected by it. The vessel, which had been thrown over fifteen degrees, and risen bodily one foot eight inches, now righted and settled in the water; the only damage sustained, was several sheets of copper ripped off and rolled up like a sheet of paper, but not a fastening had given way, nor does any leakage indicate the slightest defect. By midnight the ice was stationary and every thing quiet.'

On the 10th of September, the ice separating, the vessel was driven into the main pack; again she broke loose, till after a series of marvellous escapes on the 29th of September, finding a well sheltered spot, they ran the vessel in and cast anchor, giving to this harbour of refuge the descriptive name of Mercy Bay.

Newly escaped from imminent danger, Mercy Bay was a welcome resting place; but the reality of their condition soon forced itself upon them. They had attained, by the endurance and efforts of a year, a position simply rather north of the one occupied the preceding winter. They had been almost two years from England, provisioned for little more than three years; whilst nearly another year must elapse before they could by any possibility escape from their ice-bound prison; and the experience of the last season had taught them that that escape was incomparably more unlikely than they had believed it the summer before. All that might be brought in by the hunting parties could scarcely compensate for the eleven barrels of beef lost on the coast of America, when on one occasion the ship having grounded, they were, to lighten her, placed in a boat, which most unfortunately upset. A large depôt of provisions had also been placed on Prince of Wales Island, to meet the possibility of their having to abandon the ship, and take the direction of the Mackenzie River. Under these circumstances Captain McClure decided to put the whole ship's company upon two-thirds of the *then* navy allowance, since that period considerably increased. The officers' private mess stores were exhausted. But when men are to be always hungry, when every morsel is measured, and the offal of slaughtered game becomes a precious perquisite of the hunter, it is better that all should fare alike. The daily dieting was 11 oz. of bread, $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. preserved meat, 2 oz. vegetables, a modicum of cocoa or tea, and $\frac{1}{2}$ a gill of rum on alternate days. After eating as little as the cravings of hunger would allow at breakfast, the remaining portion of each individual was put away for his dinner. Dinner over, nothing remained till the following morning, but in the course of the afternoon a minute quantity of tea or cocoa boiled in water, and taken, not to satisfy hunger, but to relieve the gnawing of emptiness. All large game, the hunter's perquisite excepted, was equally divided, and served out by weight, instead of ship's provisions. They had not yet learned that to suck the blood of the fresh slaughtered deer was a welcome luxury; that was yet to come. Nor was the want of food their only deprivation. The same rigid economy had to be exercised in the article of light. For very short intervals

only could they indulge in the luxury of seeing, or willing away these dreary days by the help of reading, the pencil or the pen. On the anniversary of the discovery of the North-west Passage, an abundant repast was spread for all; and again on Christmas Day, after enjoying a plentiful dinner, they toasted the friends left behind.

As spring advanced there was but small inducement for travelling parties; they could only go again over the ground surveyed the year before. They had no strength now to throw away, and the full allowance of food necessary to support the exertion of travelling, had become a serious consideration. Hunting was a constant resource equally beneficial for health and spirits: it led to many adventures; but we must leave them to that fuller and more detailed account of Captain M'Clure's voyage, which the public are encouraged to expect from the able pen of Captain Sherard Osborn, merely glancing at a veteran serjeant of marines attacked by musk bulls, who, after firing away all his ammunition, and even the 'worm' of his gun, dispatched his last adversary, by firing the ramrod through his heart. One officer was tracked and nearly surrounded by wolves; and another having lost his way in an impenetrable fog, found his way back to the ship by no other token than the direction of the wind blowing on his cheek.

One journey was undertaken, and that of such importance that Captain M'Clure himself commanded the party, to Winter Harbour, Melville Island, where Captain Parry had wintered in 1819-20, for here he hoped to meet with information, if not with assistance, from England. In his original instructions he was commanded to endeavour to reach Melville Island. At the Sandwich Islands, in July 1850, he heard of Captain Austin's expedition, and he had himself distinctly stated in his letter to the Admiralty, committed to the charge of Captain Kellett, that he should try to reach that point. This letter he calculated would be received in England early in 1852. Captain M'Clure began his journey April 11th, and returned on the 9th of May. He found a record that Winter Harbour had been visited by Lieutenant M'Clintock the preceding year, then serving with Captain Austin, but no word of hope as to the future, no intimation of stores being left, or assistance intended. With these bitter tidings he returned to the ship. Their countrymen had been comparatively within hail: they were gone, and the solitude on board that lonely vessel seemed deeper than before.

But at home they were not forgotten. The 'Erebus' and 'Terror' had sailed from England in May 1845: it was only

the most sanguine who dared indulge the hope that Sir John Franklin and his brave companions could have survived the horrors of seven Arctic winters. Many expeditions had gone forth in search of them, and all had returned in safety, although with no intelligence beyond that of the graves and remains found on Cape Riley, seen and described by the officers and men of Captain Austin's squadron, and by Captain Penny and his followers. The 'Enterprise,' Captain Collinson, had been heard of as late as the summer of 1851, to the north of Behring's Straits. Baffled in his attempt to penetrate to the east or north-east in 1850, (having arrived there a fortnight after the 'Investigator,') Captain Collinson passed the winter at Hong Kong, whence he had returned to the ice, with provisions for three years. Of the 'Investigator,' no tidings had reached England since she exchanged numbers with the 'Plover,' August 5th, 1850. Should she not return to England that autumn, or find means of obtaining fresh supplies, her condition would become terrible to contemplate before the summer of 1854 could set her free. The Duke of Northumberland, then at the head of the Admiralty, gave the subject his earnest attention. The Arctic Committee was called together, to deliberate on the best measures to be taken to rescue the gallant adventurers who seemed cut off from all human succour. As may be seen by the Blue Book of 1851, the recommendation of the Committee was, that four vessels should be prepared to advance to the northward by Wellington Channel, leaving a fifth as store ship or depôt at Beechy Island. This advice was grounded on the inference that the remains at Cape Riley indicated Sir John Franklin having taken that direction. The Committee also urged the continuance of store ships at Behring's Straits, to assist the crews of the 'Erebus' or 'Terror,' the 'Enterprise' or 'Investigator;' as should any of those ships return at all, they confidently anticipated it would be in that direction, having come to the decision that a passage for anything larger than boats along the northern shores of America was simply impossible. But there were persons who entirely differed as to the inferences to be deduced from these premises. The First Lord was again consulted, and carefully reconsidered the subject. An Arctic meeting was once more summoned, and the conclusion arrived at, that whilst Sir Edward Belcher in the 'Assistance,' and Commander Sherard Osborn in the 'Pioneer' tender, were to go to the northward, Captain Kellett in the 'Resolute,' and Commander McClintock in the 'Intrepid,' should be directed to make the best of their way to Melville

Island, leaving the 'North Star,' Captain Pullen, as a *dépôt* ship, at Beechy Island. Sir Edward Belcher and his five well-appointed vessels left the Thames in April 1852. No information, direct or indirect, of any of the missing ships reached England during that year.

On board the 'Investigator,' the season of 1852 dragged heavily along: not even the indomitable courage of their Captain or the noble spirit of officers and men could entirely resist the influence of a singularly cold foggy summer. Young ice began to form in July, and was eight inches thick, when on the 17th of September, a fresh gale from the S.S.E. might have set the vessel free. When all hope of emancipation for that season was over, and with it the certainty that nine or ten months longer must elapse before the ship could escape from her present position, the future claimed from Captain M'Clure his most anxious consideration. There was before them but a choice of dangers. To remain as they were was death. At their present rate of allowance, their supplies could hold out little more than a year; but were it even possible to have made them last longer, it was becoming evident that none would survive the continuous effects of unsatisfied hunger. In a more genial climate, life might probably have been maintained upon it, but the human frame requires a far larger supply, and more nutritious food, when exposed to severe cold, than in warmer regions.

Captain M'Clure decided upon dividing the ship's company in the following spring. Those among the crew whose health was the strongest, and most likely to endure still further hardships, were to remain with him by the ship; the others were to leave him. One party of from twenty to thirty was to accompany the first lieutenant, Mr. Haswell, with sledges and as much food as they could carry (a relief party being sent forward to assist them), to Cape Spencer, Beechy Island, where they depended on finding supplies of provisions. Should neither Melville Island nor Beechy Island afford them the assistance they required, their instructions were to push on, if possible, or Pond's Bay, in the hope of falling in with whalers to convey tidings to England of the 'Investigator,' and to ask for a ship with supplies to meet Captain M'Clure and the men with him at Port Leopold in 1854. This was a service of no common danger: but it sunk into insignificance compared with the desperate task allotted to the second lieutenant, Mr. Gurney ~~Cresswell~~, with Mr. Miertsching, the interpreter, and six of the ~~crew~~. This was to reach the mouth of the Muckenzie River, taking advantage on their way of the stores left at Prince of

Wales Island, and thence to strike for the nearest of the Hudson's Bay settlements, a distance of from 600 to 700 miles, depending solely on their guns for subsistence. Their probable fate is told in the mournful tidings and relies of Sir John Franklin and his party brought home by Dr. Rae. Lieutenant Cresswell was to bear with him the same request as Lieutenant Haswell for help to meet them next year at Port Leopold. These arrangements met with the entire concurrence of all concerned; and with the quiet resolution of Englishmen they prepared for a last struggle for life and deliverance.

The second anniversary of the North-west Passage was kept as before, and Christmas was welcomed with good cheer and a sort of grim festivity. Captain M'Clure's despatches continued to be written in the same cheerful hopeful spirit; but facts are stubborn things, and as the winter advanced he tells of sickness, and alludes to hardships patiently endured, but not the less felt. One of the mates, Mr. Sainsbury, was gradually sinking in a decline; the health of the other, Mr. Wynniatt, was completely shattered by continued privation and tension of the nervous system. The report of the medical officers of the ship proves that at this time many men on board were more or less affected by scurvy or other diseases. An officer or sailor might be heard exhorting his comrade to put on a more cheerful countenance, or not to speak in so dismal a tone, unconscious that the attenuated features of his friend reflected his own, and that his voice was but the echo of the sepulchral tones of another.

On the 15th of March the officers and men about to leave the ship were put on full allowance to recruit their strength for travelling. How necessary this was, may be gathered from one illustration. An officer small in stature, and of slight frame, gained thirty pounds in weight in three months from that time. The 13th of April was the day named for the dispersion of the crew; preparations were going on, but the general state of mind was one more of apathy than excitement.

It was two o'clock in the afternoon of the 6th of April; Captain M'Clure and Mr. Haswell were walking on the floe; few people were on the deck, the greater part below, many in their berths. Captain M'Clure and Mr. Haswell observed a man running towards them; they fancied it one of their own people pursued by a bear, and hastened to his help. As they came nearer, they perceived it was a stranger. As soon as his voice could be heard, he panted out, 'Lieutenant Pim!' 'Resolute!' 'Captain Kellett!' The cry was raised on board; the only open hatchway was choked with people tumbling up from below;

an hurrah was attempted, but it was beyond that. In an hour or two, men might be seen standing or sitting in twos or threes, talking very quietly, almost solemnly. They were saved,—they belonged once more to a living world,—but time was needed to convince them of their deliverance. From Lieutenant Pim, they learned that in September 1852, Captain Kellett had placed a *dépôt* of stores in Winter Harbour, Melville Island; but, not opening the cairn in which Captain M'Clure's record was deposited, he had not discovered that document, left there in the preceding April. It was first found in October 1853, when a party from the '*Resolute*' again visited Winter Harbour, with a further supply of provisions. As soon as travelling was possible, Lieutenant Bedford Pim was despatched, by Captain Kellett, to Mercy Bay, to ascertain if the '*Investigator*' was still there,—a most toilsome and difficult journey. On the 7th of April, the day after Lieutenant Pim's arrival, M'Clure set out with him for Dealy Island, Melville Island, where the '*Resolute*' then lay. Captain Kellett must describe his arrival there:—

'At nine o'clock this day our look-out man made the signal for a party coming in from the westward; all went out to meet them, and assist them in. A second party was then seen. Dr. Domville was the first person I met. I cannot describe my feelings when he told me that Captain M'Clure was among the next party. I was not long in reaching him and giving him many hearty shakes; no purer were ever given by two men in this world. M'Clure looks well, but is very hungry. His description of Pim's making the Harbour of Mercy, would have been a fine subject for the pen of Captain Marryat, were he alive.'

That the sick men might, as soon as possible, obtain more and better food, besides the immense importance of change of scene and companionship, Captain M'Clure arranged, on leaving the ship, that on the 15th Lieutenant Gurney Cresswell should follow him,* with Mr. Wynniatt, mate, Mr. Piers, assistant-surgeon, Mr. Miertsching, interpreter, and twenty-four petty officers and seamen, from the most sickly part of the crew.

In that short interval two deaths occurred, making three (the three first during their protracted voyage) within a very few days. On the 2nd of May Captain Kellett speaks of their arrival, 'bringing two men on their sledge,' and of their having 'made an extraordinary passage, for men in their state.' He adds, 'the greater part of them are affected with scurvy, but all 'rapidly improving.' Everything that kindness or tenderness could suggest, was done for them on board the '*Resolute*' and '*Intrepid*.' An officer of one of those ships described their

appearance as distressing, not so much from their extreme thinness and the effects of bodily illness, as from the gaze of vacuity with which they wandered round the ship, looking as though they looked not, and scarcely noticing anything.

Captains Kellett and M'Clure, desiring to forward information to England, and to ensure its reaching Beechy Island whilst the sledging season lasted, directed Lieutenant Cresswell to proceed thither, and to 'deliver Commander M'Clure's despatches to the commanding officer of the "North Star," who would cause copies to be made of them, for the information of Sir Edward Belcher, and return the original, sealed, to Lieutenant Cresswell, for conveyance to England.' Mr. Roche, mate of the 'Resolute,' had charge of the party; Lieutenant Wynniatt accompanied Lieutenant Cresswell, as his state of health demanded an immediate return home. None of the others were sufficiently recovered to pursue their journey further, though Lieutenant Cresswell found it easy, even pleasurable, compared with the service he had just performed, of bringing so sickly and infirm a company from Mercy Bay to the 'Resolute.' He arrived at Beechy Island on the 2nd of June. Commander Pullen received him with the warmest welcome; the tidings were forwarded to Sir Edward Belcher, in Wellington Channel, and then came the question, how Lieutenant Cresswell could complete his mission, in the event of no ship arriving from England. With some difficulty, he obtained from Commander Pullen permission to repair the eight ton 'Mary' yacht, belonging formerly to Sir John Ross, and purchased of him by Government, which was lying there, to cover in her deck, leaving room only for the steersman, and make her ready for the possibility of a voyage to England. Four men volunteered to accompany him, for more than four the little vessel could not carry provisions. He wrung from Captain Pullen an unwilling consent, that should no vessel arrive before the 20th of August, he might then take his departure. The venture was not needed, for on the 8th, Commander Inglefield in the 'Phoenix,' with the store ship 'Breadalbane,' appeared off Beechy Island.

On board the 'Phoenix' was the much-lamented Lieutenant Bellot of the French navy. Very characteristic was his greeting to Lieutenant Cresswell: 'To have accomplished that which you have done, I would gladly die.'

On the night of the 20th of August, a rapid run of the outer floe from the westward, placed both the 'Phoenix' and the 'Breadalbane' in imminent danger: the former, after a fearful nip, rose from it; not so the 'Breadalbane,' which yielded to the pressure and gradually settled down beneath the ice, scarcely

affording those on board time to escape. Fortunately her stores had been taken out before the catastrophe occurred. When the 'Phoenix' arrived, Commander Pullen was gone to communicate with Sir Edward Belcher, and as by the time he returned further delay would have risked the loss of that season, Captain Inglefield prepared for his voyage home. Lieutenant Gurney Cresswell accompanied him, bearing the despatches of Captain M'Clure to the Admiralty. They landed at Thurso in the extreme north of Scotland, and thence by coach and rail pursued their rapid journey to London, carefully preserving their secret, till at five A.M. on the morning of the 7th of October, they awakened Mr. Barrow to tell him that his father's long-cherished hope had been fulfilled and the North-west Passage accomplished.

But whilst the intelligence of Captain M'Clure's success and safety was received with enthusiasm in England, he himself was entering his fifth year in the ice. Within a day or two after despatching Lieutenant Cresswell to Beechy Island, Captain M'Clure returned to the 'Investigator': the surgeon of the 'Resolute' accompanied him, to examine into the health of the remaining officers and men. It had been arranged between Captain Kellett and Commander M'Clure, that unless twenty able-bodied seamen volunteered to remain with him he could not continue in his ship. But the crew of the 'Investigator' had endured too much, to encounter of their own free will another winter; only four men volunteered to stay; and Commander M'Clure and his men, leaving their possessions and associations behind them, looked their last look at the good ship which had borne them through so many dangers, and prepared to accept the kindly welcome which awaited them in Captain Kellett's vessels. It is said that after years of captivity, and whilst rejoicing in deliverance, the prisoner sighs as he leaves his dungeon; can we be surprised, that it was not without emotion, that these brave men, after all they had suffered and effected, quitted the scene of so much endurance? The next spring a travelling party coming in sight of the 'Investigator,' saw the ensign still flying at the peak, but there was water in the hold and she was settling slowly down into her icy sepulchre.

When the open season approached, every exertion was made by Captain Kellett and Commander M'Clintock to carry the 'Resolute' and 'Intrepid' to Beechy Island, but in vain. After drifting in the pack for two months they were frozen in hard and fast. In accordance with orders from Sir Edward Belcher, the ships were abandoned by their officers and crew May 15th, 1854, and with Commander M'Clure and the crew of

the 'Investigator' they pursued their way to Beechy Island. On the 24th of August, Sir Edward Belcher finally left the 'Assistance' and the 'Pioneer' firmly frozen in Wellington Channel, and in his gig with the other ships' boats arrived the following day at Beechy Island.

The season of 1854 having so far advanced without any vessel making its appearance from England, the officers and crew of the five different ships remaining in the ice, amounting, with the officers and crew of the 'North Star,' to 263 persons, prepared to return in that vessel to England. The 'North Star,' after the labour for two months of the crews of the three ships, had been cut out of the ice, and reached the edge of the floe; by the 21st of August all was ready for departure, and the 'North Star' under weigh, when on the 26th, the 'Phoenix,' Captain Inglefield, with the tender 'Talbot,' was seen in the offing, and by her opportune arrival gave space and comfort for the voyage home.

A telegraph despatch from Cork, received at the Admiralty September 29th, announced the arrival of the 'Phoenix' with Captain M'Clure and other officers on board, and that the 'Talbot' and 'North Star' were following with the remaining officers and men. Captain M'Clure was received at the Admiralty with the consideration his services deserved. His post rank, accorded him the year before, was antedated to the earliest possible period after his discovery of the North-west Passage. Promotion was freely dealt out amongst the other officers. The gold medals of the Geographical Societies both of England and France have been since presented to Captain M'Clure. Parliament has voted 10,000*l.* to him and his ship's company, as the first to accomplish the North-west Passage; 5000*l.* for Captain M'Clure himself, and the remainder to be divided between his officers and men. A recommendation has also been received from the Committee of the House of Commons appointed to consider these claims, that medals should be given to all the officers and men, who have been engaged in these perilous services; and we trust that Sir Robert M'Clure, as we must now call him, will long continue to render that name an honour to the British navy in services of a more practical character than those he has performed in the bleak field of Arctic discovery. It would, however, be wrong to underrate the value of these expeditions in keeping alive during peace the heroism and enterprise of the British navy. Several of those who took part in these voyages have already earned fresh distinction in the Baltic and Black Sea squadrons, among whom we particularly notice Captain Sherard Osborn,

whose brilliant services in the Sea of Azoff have done incalculable damage to the enemy. The navy may be proud of its achievements in the polar regions, but the nation will rejoice that it has seen what Sir Edward Belcher terms the 'last of the Arctic voyages.'

It fortunately does not fall within the scope of these remarks to enter upon any minute examination of Sir Edward Belcher's literary or nautical pretensions: he relieves us from that duty by the admission that he 'does not assert in these volumes any claim to the participation in the solution of the Northern Passage to the Pacific,' though the continuous frozen sea traced by the officers under Sir E. Belcher's command, proves the existence of a water communication through Wellington Channel, round Parry Islands to the position obtained by Captain M'Clure. But we must express our regret that these volumes, bearing the pompous title of 'the Last of the Arctic Voyages,' and published under the authority of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty with unusual typographical magnificence, should have so little claim on the public attention. They are written in a style which is at once vulgar, querulous, and incorrect; they add nothing to the annals of Arctic discovery; and they establish nothing beyond the utter unfitness of their author for the task he undertook. Even in his instructions to the officers sent on sledge-parties, which ought to have been drawn up with the greatest precision, as the lives of human beings depended on them, we find Sir E. Belcher addressing this strange exhortation to Commander Richards: —

'It is needless for me to exhort you or Lieutenant Osborn to do anything but *return securely*, and without allowing your own high feeling to be the standard by which those who labour under you are to be urged forward.' (Vol. ii. p. 43.)

Happily these gallant officers *did* return securely, and consequently did not obey the injunction of their sapient commander. His language in every page of this narrative is equally absurd and unintelligible; and it is unfortunate that whilst no full or authentic account has yet been published of Sir Robert M'Clure's remarkable voyage, Sir Edward Belcher should have been allowed to obtrude on the public this clumsy narrative of his own proceedings.

- ART. VIII. — 1. *Bibliothèque Contemporaine*. 2^e Série. DE STENDHAL. Œuvres complètes. Paris: 1854-55. En vente.
2. *Vies de Haydn, et Mozart, et de Métastase*. Nouvelle édition. 1 vol.
3. *Histoire de la Peinture en Italie*. Nouvelle édition, entièrement revue. 1 vol.
4. *Rome, Naples, et Florence*. Nouvelle édition. Préface inédite. 1 vol.
5. *De L'Amour*. Seule édition complète. Augmentée de Préfaces et de Fragments entièrement inédits. 1 vol.
6. *Vie de Rossini*. Nouvelle édition, entièrement revue. 1 vol.
7. *Racine et Shakespeare: Etudes sur Le Romantisme*. Nouvelle édition, entièrement revue et augmentée d'un grand nombre de Fragments inédits. 1 vol.
8. *Promenades dans Rome*. Nouvelle édition. 2 vols.
9. *Mémoires d'un Touriste*. Préface et la plus grande Partie d'un Volume inédite. 2 vols.
10. *Le Rouge et Le Noir*. *Chronique du XIX^e Siècle*. Nouvelle édition. 1 vol.
11. *La Chartreuse de Parme*. Nouvelle édition, entièrement revue. 1 vol.
12. *Romans et Nouvelles*. Précédés d'une Notice sur De Stendhal, par M. B. COLOMB. 1 vol.
13. *Correspondance Inédite*. Précédée d'une Introduction, par PROSPER MERIMÉE, de l'Académie Française; ornée d'un beau Portrait de Stendhal. 2 vols.

THE literary career of Henri Beyle, who wrote under the pseudonyme of M. De Stendhal, deserves to be commemorated, if only as a curious illustration of the caprice of criticism; or it may well be cited in proof of the occasional readiness of contemporaries to forestall the judgment of posterity, when there is no longer a living and sentient object for their jealousy. His habits were simple, his tastes were of a nature to be easily and cheaply gratified, and his pecuniary wants were consequently of the most modest description. He would have been content, he tells us, to rub on with 4000 francs a year at Paris; he would have thought himself rich with 6000; and in an autobiographical sketch he says, 'The only thing I see clearly is, that for twenty years my *ideal* has

'been to live at Paris in a fourth story, writing a drama or a 'novel.' This ideal was never realised, because the booksellers and theatrical managers would not, or could not, bid high enough for dramas or novels from his pen; and he was eventually compelled to accept the consulship at Civita Vecchia, where the closing period of his life was shortened by the diseases of the climate, as well as embittered by disappointment and ennui. There occurred, indeed, one striking exception to this general indifference. In the 'Revue Parisienne' of September 23rd, 1840, appeared a long and carefully written article, entitled an 'Etude sur H. Beyle,' by Balzac, in which 'La Chartreuse de Parme' was declared to be a masterpiece, and its author was described as one of the finest observers and most original writers of the age. But although elaborately reasoned out, and largely supported by analysis and quotation, this honourable outburst of enthusiasm was commonly regarded as an extravagance into which Balzac had been hurried by an exaggeration of generosity towards a fancied rival; and Beyle's courteous letter of acknowledgment contains the following sentence, showing how little disposed he was to overestimate his position or his hopes:—'This astounding article, such as no writer ever before received from another, I have read, I now venture to own to you, with bursts of laughter. Every time I came to a eulogium a little exalted, and I encountered such at every step, I saw the expression of my friends' faces at reading it.'

Could he wake from the dead and see his friends' faces now, his characteristic smile of irony, rather than loud laughter, would be the form in which his feelings might be most appropriately expressed; for those friends have not waited till 1880, the earliest era at which he expected to be read; they have barely exceeded the time prescribed by Horace—*nonumque prematur in annum*—for testing the soundness of a work. Beyle died in 1842, and few beyond the very limited circle of his intimates then seemed aware that a chosen spirit had departed, or that a well of valuable thought and a fountain of exquisite sensibility had been dried up. One solitary garland of *immortelles* was flung upon his grave. An essay on his life and character, by M. Auguste Bussière, appeared in the 'Revue des Deux Mondes' for January, 1843; but the first paragraph was an avowal of the hazardous character of the attempt:—

'We approach a task which is at the same time both embarrassing and seducing, that of appreciating a man of talent whose upright character and original qualities seemed to promise a greater extent of influence than he has exercised on his contemporaries. We shall encounter in this mind and

‘ in this character odd specialities, strange anomalies, contradictions which will explain how, after having been more vaunted than read, more read than relished, more decried than judged, more cited than known, he has lived, if the expression may be used, in a sort of clandestine celebrity, to die an obscure and unmarked death. Contemporary literature, it must be owned, has found before the tomb of one of its most distinguished cultivators, only silence, or words worse than silence. M. Beyle dead, all has been said for him. His remains have not seen their funeral attendance swelled by those regrets which delight in display, and which come to seek under the folds of the pall a reflexion of the lustre shed by the living.’

A noble English poet, after an ordinary night's sleep, awoke and found himself famous. Beyle must have slumbered thirteen years, dating from the commencement of his last long sleep, before he could have calculated on a similar surprise on waking. But his hour has come at last, and come sooner than he anticipated. We have now (1855) before us popular and cheap editions of almost all his books (thirteen volumes), in addition to two closely printed volumes of correspondence, and three volumes of novels from his unpublished MS., bearing striking evidence to the assiduity with which every scrap of his composition has been hunted up. We have, moreover, a somewhat embarrassing superfluity of biographical notices from surviving friends, who, whatever their amount of agreement with Balzac in 1840, have no objection to respond to the popular demand for Beyle testimonials in 1855. Prefixed to the ‘Correspondence’ is a condensed and pithy series of clever, polished, highly illustrative, and by no means enthusiastic, notes and reminiscences by M. Merimée. M. Sainte-Beuve has devoted two papers, distinguished by his wonted refinement and penetration, to Stendhal, in the ‘Causeries du Lundi.’ An extremely interesting biographical notice, drawn up by M. Colomb, Beyle's most attached friend and testamentary executor, from private papers and other authentic sources of information, is prefixed to the ‘Romans et Nouvelles;’ and by way of preface or introduction to the ‘Chartreuse de Parme,’ the publishers have judiciously reprinted the long-neglected *éloge* of Balzac. As if to complicate the problem, Beyle's critics and biographers announce and claim him as ‘eminently French,’ although he systematically ridiculed the vanity of his countrymen, reviled their taste, disliked the greater part of their literature, and, deliberately repudiating his country as ‘le plus vilain pays du monde que les nigauds appellent la belle France,’ directed himself to be designated as Milanese on his tombstone. Here is enough, and more than

enough, to justify us in devoting our best attention to the social and intellectual phenomenon thus presented,—to say nothing of the interest we naturally take in the reputation of an author who, in straitened circumstances, ordered the complete collection of '*mon cher*' Edinburgh Review, and appealed to its extended circulation as an unanswerable proof that the English are more reasonable in politics than the French.

Marie-Henri Beyle was born at Grenoble, on the 23rd of January, 1783, of a family which, without being noble, was classed and lived familiarly with the provincial aristocracy. One of his earliest preceptors was a priest, who appears to have sadly misunderstood and mismanaged his pupil. 'Beyle,' says M. Merimée, 'was wont to relate with bitterness, after forty years, that one day, having torn his coat whilst at play, the Abbé entrusted with his education reprimanded him severely for this misdeed before his comrades, and told him he was a disgrace to religion and to his family. We laughed when he narrated this incident; but he saw in it simply an act of priestly tyranny and a horrible injustice, where there was nothing to laugh at, and he felt as acutely as on the day of its occurrence the wound inflicted on his self-love.' It was one of his aphorisms that our parents and our masters are our natural enemies when we enter the world; the simple matter of fact being, that his own character, tendencies, and aspirations had been invariably opposed to the plans, wishes, and modes of thinking of his family. They were clearly wrong in endeavouring to force him into uncongenial paths of study; nor was he likely to be cured of his inborn wilfulness, or his morbid sensibility, by harsh treatment. On the establishment of the École Centrale, in 1795, they had no alternative but to send him there; and such was his quickness or diligence, that when the day arrived for the examinations in '*grammaire générale*,' not one of the pupils could compete with him, and he received all the prizes that had been proposed.

During the four following years he sustained his reputation by carrying off all the first prizes in all the courses that he attended; and at the end of that time, in 1798, he concentrated his energies on mathematics for (according to M. Colomb) the strange reason that he had a horror of hypocrisy, and rightly judged that in mathematics it was impossible. A more intelligible and more likely motive was his laudable ambition to be admitted into the Polytechnic School, for which he was about to become a candidate after much anxious preparation, when a sudden change took place in his prospects; and we find him in 1800, at the age of seventeen, a supernumerary

in the ministry of war. He was indebted for this employment to the Daru family, which was distantly related to his own; and when, early in the same year, the two brothers Daru were despatched to Italy on public duty of an administrative kind, they invited Beyle to rejoin them there on the chance of some fitting occupation for him turning up. He made the journey from Geneva to Milan on horseback, following so close on the traces of the invading army, that he had to run the gauntlet before the fort of Bard, which, overlooked from its insignificance, had wellnigh frustrated the most brilliant of Napoleon's early campaigns at starting. Our young adventurer entered Milan at the beginning of June, 1800; and, on the 14th of the same month, had the good fortune to be present, as an amateur, at the battle of Marengo. An armistice having been signed the next day, he took advantage of it to visit, in company with a son of General Melas, the Boromean Isles and the other remarkable objects in the vicinity. Hurried away, we suppose, by the military spirit which animated all around him, Beyle entered a regiment of dragoons as quartermaster; and, in the course of a month, received a commission as sub-lieutenant. He served for about half a year as aide-de-camp to General Michaud, and received the most flattering certificate of courage and conduct; but before the expiration of a year (on September 17th, 1801) he was ordered to rejoin his regiment, then in garrison at Savigliano, in Piedmont, in consequence of a regulation forbidding any officer under the rank of lieutenant to be employed as aide-de-camp.

His life in a provincial town differed widely from that of the brilliant staff-officer, which, divided between Brescia and Bergamo, with frequent excursions to Milan and the Isles, and thickly sown, says his biographer, with various and romantic sensations, realised his conceptions of perfect happiness. So soon as the treaty of Amiens afforded him an honourable pretext for quitting an inactive and unexciting course of life in the army, he flung up his commission very much to the disgust of his patrons, and went to reside with his parents at Grenoble. Of course this experiment failed, but he made himself sufficiently disagreeable to extort an allowance of 150 francs a month from his father with leave to live at Paris, where, in June, 1807, he took up his elevated abode (*au cinquième*) in the Rue d'Angivilliers, and without seeking for introductions or aiming at immediate distinction, calmly and resolutely set about educating himself anew. Montesquien, Montaigne, Cabanis, Destutt de Tracy, Say, J. J. Rousseau, were his favourite authors. He also made a careful study of Alfieri's tragedies; and out of his five

frances a day he contrived to pay masters in English and fencing. He got on tolerably well in English, although his instructor was an Irishman with a touch of the brogue; but his skill with the foil was of so equivocal a description, that Renouvier, the director of the Salle Fabien, is reported to have given him nearly the same advice which was addressed to a British peer by a celebrated French fencing master, when his lordship was settling account with him at the conclusion of a long series of lessons at a napoleon per hour: 'Milord, je vous conseille décidément d'abandonner les armes.'

Beyle's figure was ill adapted for active exercises; but his nerves, which grew tremulous at the slightest touch of emotion, were firm as steel in the presence of danger; his eye was good, and he attained to such proficiency with the pistol as to be able once, when anxious to display his skill, to bring down a bird upon the wing at forty yards' distance. The reputation thus acquired (perhaps by a happy accident) was far from useless for a man of his character, who was then daily liable to be called to account for the indiscreet indulgence of his peculiar humour. Towards the conclusion of his career he writes: 'I ought to have been killed a dozen times for epigrams or *mots piquants* that cannot be forgotten; and yet I have received only three wounds,—two of which are of little consequence, those in the hand and the left foot.' One of his maxims was, to catch at the first occasion for a duel on entering life; and his receipt for a first duel, which he pronounced infallible, runs thus: 'Whilst your adversary is taking his aim, look at a tree, and begin counting the leaves. One pre-occupation will distract from another of a graver kind. Whilst taking aim yourself, recite two Latin verses; this will prevent you from firing too quickly, and neutralise that five per cent. of emotion which has sent so many balls twenty feet above the mark.'

About this time (1803), Beyle formed the curious project of writing a comedy, in one act and in prose, to confute the critical canons of the celebrated Geoffroy. It was to be called 'Quelle Horreur! Ou l'ami du despotisme pervertisseur de l'opinion publique.' He worked at it, from time to time, for ten or twelve years; and then definitively abandoned it. In 1805 he renewed the experiment of domestic life at Grenoble, which this time was curiously and characteristically interrupted. He fell in love with an actress; and, on her leaving Grenoble on a professional engagement for Marseilles, he pretended a sudden inclination for commerce, and became clerk to a Marseilles firm of dealers in colonial produce, with

whom he remained a year, when the lady married a rich Russian magnate, and Beyle returned to Paris. Having contracted a fixed taste for intellectual pursuits, he was with difficulty persuaded by his friends, the Darus, to attach himself once more to their fortunes. He complied, however, and rejoined them in Germany, where he was present, as a non-combatant, at the battle of Jena and witnessed the triumphant entry of Napoleon into Berlin in 1806. A few days after this event, Count Daru (the father) procured for Beyle the place of *intendant* of the domains of the Emperor in Brunswick, which he held two years, profiting by his residence in the Duchy to study the German language and philosophy. Here, again, he gave signal proof of both moral and physical courage. He put down an insurrection in a town, the garrison of which had just quitted it, by the bold expedient of arming the invalid soldiers left behind in a hospital, and suddenly leading them against the crowd. An instance of his energy as an administrator is thus related by M. Mérimée:—

‘According to his wonted mode of showing himself worse than he was, he affected to despise the enthusiasm that made the men of his epoch do such great things. “We had the sacred fire,” he observed, “and I among the rest, though unworthy. I had been sent to Brunswick, to levy an extraordinary contribution of five millions. I raised seven millions, and I narrowly escaped being torn in pieces by the populace, who were exasperated at the excess of my zeal. The Emperor inquired the name of the auditor who had so acted, and said ‘C’est bien.’”’

It would have been difficult to discover another auditor similarly circumstanced, who would have refrained from putting into his own pocket one, at least, of the two extra millions; and it is far from clear that the Emperor would have trusted or respected him less on that account, so long as the imperial demands were fully answered. Napoleon commonly knew to a fraction the amount of the illicit gains of his functionaries, as the famous contractor Ouvrard discovered to his cost. This man was once foolish enough to bet that Mademoiselle Georges would sup with him instead of keeping her known engagement to sup, on a specified night, at the Tuileries. He overcame her scruples by a bribe of 200,000 francs, and won his wager. The day following, he was ordered to attend the Emperor, and was thus quietly addressed:—‘M. Ouvrard, you have gained five millions by your contracts for the supply of the army in Spain: you will pay two into the imperial Treasury without delay.’ This state of things and tone of feeling must be kept in mind

in appreciating a man like Beyle, who, after dealing with millions in times of commotion and confusion, died in exile because he could never muster capital enough to secure an annuity of 160*l.* a year.

In his capacity of auditor he was attached to the grand army during the invasion of Russia, and had his full share of the glories, dangers, and privations of the retreat. He was among the few, says M. Mérimée, who, on this trying occasion, never forfeited the respect of others. One day, not far from the Beresina, Beyle presented himself, shaved and carefully dressed, before his chief: 'You have shaved as usual, I see,' observed M. Daru; 'you are a brave man (*un homme de cœur*).' In a letter from Moscow he has given one of the most graphic and picturesque accounts we are acquainted with of the fire. It concludes thus:—

'We left the city lighted up by the finest conflagration in the world, forming an immense pyramid, which, like the prayers of the faithful, had its base on earth and its summit in heaven. The moon appeared above this atmosphere of flame and smoke. It was an imposing spectacle, but one ought to have been alone, or surrounded by men of mind, to enjoy it. That which has spoilt the Russian campaign for me, is to have made it with people who would have commonplacéd the Coliseum and the Bay of Naples.'

He said he had not suffered so very much from hunger during the retreat, but found it impossible to recall to memory how he had procured food, or what he had eaten, with the exception of a lump of tallow, for which he had paid twenty francs, and which he always recollected with delight. Before setting out on this expedition he deemed it prudent to take especial precautions against the want of ready money. His sister replaced all the buttons of a surtout by gold pieces of twenty and forty francs, covered with cloth. On his return she asked if this expedient had answered. He had never once thought of it since his departure. By dint of taxing his memory, he recalled a vague impression of having given the old surtout to the waiter of an inn near Wilna, with the gold buttons sewed up as at Paris. This incident, observes M. Colomb, is truly illustrative, for Beyle was excessively given to precaution, without a parallel for forgetfulness, and reckless to the last degree.

He abided faithfully by the declining fortunes of Napoleon, and did good service in the crisis of 1814; but he was destined never to enjoy the reward of his devotion; and when the crash came, he bore his ruin with so philosophical an air, that many superficial observers openly accused him of ingratitude and tergiversation. The best answer to such charges was his re-

fusal to apply or lay himself out for office under the restored monarchy, although a fair opening was managed for him by his friends.

In August, 1814, he left Paris for Milan, where he resided till 1821, with the exception of visits to Paris and London in 1817. At Milan he enjoyed in perfection the precise kind of life which suited him. The opera was a never-failing source of enjoyment; and there was no department of the fine arts from which he could not draw both instruction and amusement at will. The cosmopolite character of his taste may be inferred from the manner in which he speaks in a letter, dated October, 1818, of Viganò, the composer of ballets:—

‘Every man who has an immense success in his own country is remarkable in the eyes of a philosopher. Viganò, I repeat, has had this success. For example, 4000 francs a year has been usually paid to the composers of ballets; he has 44,000 for 1819. A Parisian will exclaim, *Fi, l’horreur!* He may speak in good faith; only I shall add aside, so much the worse for him. If Viganò discovers the art of writing gestures and groups, I maintain that in 1860, he will be more spoken of than Madame de Staël. Therefore, I have a right to call him a great man, or at least, a very remarkable man, and superior, like Rossini or Canova, to all that you have at Paris in the fine arts or literature.’

In another letter, in which he repeats and justifies this opinion, he says, ‘I pass my evenings with Rossini and Monti: all things considered, I prefer extraordinary men to ordinary ones.’ Amongst the extraordinary men with whom he associated on familiar terms at Milan was Lord Byron, who thus alludes to the circumstance in a letter to Beyle in 1823:—‘You have done me too much honour by what you have been so good as to say of me in your work; but that which has caused me as much pleasure as the praise is to learn at last (by accident) that I am indebted for it to one whose esteem I was really ambitious to obtain. So many changes have taken place since this epoch in our Milan circle, that I hardly dare revive the memory of it. Death, exile, and Austrian prisons, have separated those we loved. Poor Pellico! I hope that in his cruel solitude his Muse consoles him sometimes, to charm us once again when her poet shall be restored again with herself to liberty.’

Beyle’s account of their introduction and dinner with Monti is quoted in Moore’s ‘Life of Byron.’ In March, 1818, he writes thus to a friend who was anxious that he should become a candidate for office:—

‘Without hating any one, I have always been exquisitely abhorred

by half of my official relations, &c. &c. To conclude, I like Italy. I pass from seven o'clock to midnight every evening in listening to music; the climate does the rest. Do you know that during the last six weeks we have been at 14° of Reaumur? Do you know that at Venice one lives like a gentleman for nine *lire* a day, and that the Venetian *lira* is fifty centimes. I shall live a year or two longer at Milan, then as much at Venice, and then, in 1821, pressed by misfortune, I shall go to Cularo; I shall sell the apartment, for which I was offered 10,000 francs this year, and I shall try my fortune at Paris.'

By a strange coincidence of untoward events, which could not have been so much as guessed when this plan of life was sketched, he was eventually compelled to adhere to it. His father died in the course of the following year (June, 1819), and left him less than half of the 100,000 francs on which he had calculated; and in July 1820 he writes to announce 'the greatest misfortune that could happen to him,'—'the hardest blow he had ever received in his life.' A report had got about, and was generally credited at Milan, that he was a secret agent of the French Government. 'It has been circulating for six months. I observed that many persons tried to avoid saluting me: I cared little about this, when the kind Plana wrote me the letter which I enclose. I am not angry with him; yet here is a terrible blow. For, after all, what is this Frenchman doing here? Milanese simplicity will never be able to comprehend my philosophic life, and that I live here, on five thousand francs, better than at Paris on twelve thousand.' He had partly himself to blame for this disagreeable position: for he was fond of mystifying people by playing tricks with his name, or by adopting odd names and signatures, as well as by giving counterfeit, shifting, and contradictory descriptions of his birth, rank, and profession.

'When,' says M^r Colomb, 'he had to give his address to a tailor or bootmaker, it was rarely that he gave his real name. This led to *quid pro quos* which amused him. Thus, he was inquired for by turns under the names of Bel, Beil, Bell, Lebel, &c. As to his profession, it depended on the caprice of the moment. At Milan he gave himself out for a superior officer of dragoons who had obtained his discharge in 1814, and son of a general of artillery. All these little inventions were but jokes; he never derived any advantage from them beyond a little amusement.'

This excuse might have been partially admissible if, in the aristocratic society of Milan, he had given himself out for an ex-corporal and the son of a tailor; but the assumption of a superior grade and higher birth savours strongly of a censurable amount of petty vanity; and such tricks were the height of

folly in a town like Milan, where both the governing and the governed were naturally prone to suspect treachery.

Whilst he was yet hesitating what course to pursue, the police settled the matter by summarily ordering him to leave the Austrian territory, upon the gratuitous supposition that he was affiliated to the sect of Carbonari. From 1821 to 1830, he resided at Paris, where he was an established member of the circles which comprised the leading notabilities of the period, male and female, political, social, literary, and artistical.

'It is from this epoch,' says M. Colomb, 'that his reputation as *homme d'esprit*, and *conteur agréable* (both these terms are untranslatable) dates. Society listened with pleasure—with a sustained interest—to that multitude of anecdotes which his vast memory and his lively imagination produced under a graceful, coloured, original form. People recognised in the narrator the man who had studied and seen much, and observed with acuteness. Across the profound changes undergone by the *salon* life since 1789, he recalled attention, in a limited degree, to the taste which reigned at that time amongst those who guided it; he succeeded in generalising the conversation,—a difficult and almost disused thing in our days, when, if three people are gathered together, there are two conversations proceeding simultaneously without any connexion; when *roués* resemble public places open to all comers, and where about as much *esprit* is consumed as at a costume ball, composed of persons who see each other for the first time. Beyle's agreeability frequently enabled him to triumph over all the dissolvents which tend to destroy French society.'

And a very great triumph it was, if we consider the period and the angry passions which then divided the company that he thus contrived to amalgamate by the introduction of well-chosen topics, by his felicitous mode of treating them, by his varied knowledge, his lively fancy, and his tact. The reason why M. Colomb is obliged to go back to a period antecedent to 1789 for his model of drawing-room life, is, that the French thenceforth ceased to be the gay, laughing, pleasure-seeking nation of which we have read or heard traditionally. Serious practical politics are a sad drawback to lively and clever conversation, not merely because any dull fellow can bawl out the commonplaces of his party, but because the easy interchange of mind is impeded, and our thoughts are constantly reverting, in our own despite, to the absorbing and beaten questions of the hour. But the buoyant spirits and elastic energies of a rising generation cannot be kept down. The struggle of a new school of authors or artists with a declining or superannuated one, affords ample scope for the display of wit, taste, and acquirement; and the contest between classicism and romanticism,

which raged furiously during the last years of the Restoration, was admirably adapted to the genius of a Beyle.

There can hardly be a fairer test of the position held by a man in his own country than the contemporary impression of an enlightened foreigner. In her 'France in 1829—1830,' Lady Morgan describes 'the brilliant Beyle' as the central figure of a group of notabilities at her hotel; and his *nom de guerre* figures thus with her ladyship's name in one of Viennet's versified epistles:—

'Stendhal, Morgan, Schlegel,—ne vous effrayez pas,
Muses, ce sont des noms fameux dans nos climats,
Chefs de la Propagande, ardens missionnaires,
Parlant de Romantique, et prêchant ses mystères.'

It is elsewhere recorded of him, that, besides talking well himself, he contributed largely to the social pleasures of the circles in which he mixed, by leading others to talk, and by bringing persons of congenial minds together.

'A party of eight or ten agreeable persons,' he writes, 'where the conversation is gay and anecdotic, and where weak punch is handed round at half-past twelve, is the place in the world where I enjoy myself most. There, in my element, I infinitely prefer hearing others talk to talking myself. I readily sink back into the silence of happiness; and if I talk, it is only to pay my ticket of admission.'

He named half-past twelve at night because the steady, regular, formal people are wont to retire before that time, and the field is pretty sure to be left free to those who live for intellectual intercourse, and love it for its own sake, instead of hurrying to crowd after crowd to proclaim their importance, gratify their vanity, or parade their tiresomeness. He insisted on anecdotes, facts, and incidents, in contradistinction to the vague, the declamatory, and the abstract style of conversation,—that trick of phrasemaking, as he termed it, which (in common with Byron) he detected and detested in 'Corinne.' Madame Pasta happening to say one evening of love, 'C'est une tuile qui vous tombe sur la tête;' 'Add,' said Beyle, "comme vous passez dans la vie," and then you will speak like Madame de Staël, and people will pay attention to your remark.'

In an existence like Beyle's, as in a Rembrandt picture, the bright parts stand out in broad contrast to the surrounding intensity of shade —

'Dearly bought the hidden treasure
Finer feelings can bestow;
Hearts that vibrate sweetest pleasure
Thrill the deepest notes of woe.'

‘My sensibility,’ he writes shortly before his death, ‘has become too acute. What does but graze others, wounds me to the quick. Such was I in 1799; such I am still in 1840. But I have learnt to hide all this under irony imperceptible to the common herd.’ We suspect that this sensibility somewhat resembled that of Rousseau, who, whilst laying down rules for the education of children in ‘*Emile*,’ suffered his own offspring to be brought up at a foundling hospital; or that of Sterne, who, it is alleged, neglected a dying mother to indulge in pathos over a dead donkey. In the midst of his social triumphs, Beyle more than once meditated suicide; and on one occasion, in 1828, he appears to have been driven to despair by the remissness of an English publisher, who had omitted to pay him for some articles which he had contributed to a London magazine. Under these circumstances, we can hardly wonder that the prospect of an independence induced him to accept the consulship of Trieste, which was obtained for him in September 1830 by the friends who had thriven on the revolution of July. They have been censured for not doing more for him; but it should be remembered that a party is a combination of persons who unite their talents and resources upon an understanding that, in case of success, the power and patronage thereby acquired shall be shared amongst them. There is nothing necessarily wrong in such a league, because those forming it may fairly claim credit for confidence in one another’s honesty and capacity as well as for having fixed principles of policy to carry out; and the leaders have no right to gratify their private feelings at the expense of their supporters. Now Beyle took no part in the proceedings which resulted in the temporary establishment of the Orleans dynasty upon the throne. He had encountered no danger, and was entitled to no reward. Nay, he had just before been in confidential communication with the Polignac ministry on the delicate subject of the Roman Conclave. He had made himself extremely useful, and was naturally looking forward to his reward from them. So far as his influence went, it had been exerted to depreciate and discourage the exertions of the Liberal party. ‘France,’ he had said some time before, ‘is on the high road to happiness. If they try to make her take the short cuts, they will upset the coach.’ The remark was prophetic, and does credit to his penetration.

He was supremely miserable at Trieste, and, fortunately for him, Prince Metternich refused to sanction the appointment; so he was transferred to Civita Vecchia, which was an improve-

ment, as admitting of frequent excursions to Rome. But his letters are as full as ever of longings for Parisian life.

'What a perspective,' he exclaims, 'not to see the intellectual people of Paris more than two or three times before I die! I was at a charming dinner yesterday, the finest place in the neighbourhood, trees, a fresh breeze, and thirty-three guests, who felt honoured by the presence of a consul; but not an idea, not a touch of depth or refinement. Am I destined to die surrounded by *bêtes*? It looks very like it. I am sought after; I enjoy some consideration; I have the best slice of a fish weighing fourteen pounds, the best of its kind. I had an excellent horse, which did the five miles and a half in three quarters of an hour, yet I am perishing of ennui. How many cold characters, how many geometricians, would be happy, or, at least, tranquil and satisfied, in my place! But my soul is a fire, which dies out if it does not flame up. I require three or four cubic feet of new ideas per day, as a steam-boat requires coal.'

The utmost indulgence he could obtain was leave of absence, purchased by the sacrifice of half his salary, from 1836 to 1839. In 1838 he came to London, and (according to M. Colomb) struck up a passing intimacy with Theodore Hook at the Athenæum Club. In March, 1839, on the retirement of M. Molé from the Presidency of the Council and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Beyle reluctantly resumed his official duties at Civita Vecchia. His health began to break, and he returned to Paris for medical advice in 1841. On the 22nd of March, 1842, he was struck with apoplexy in the Rue Neuve des Capucines, close to the door of the Foreign Office. He was carried to his lodging in the Rue Neuve des Petits Champs, where he expired at two o'clock the next morning, without having uttered a word, and apparently without pain, in the sixtieth year of his age. He was buried in the Cemetery of Montmartre (du Nord), and the following inscription was placed by his own express directions upon his monument: 'Arrigo Beyle, Milanese, Scrisse, Amò, Visse. Ann. 69. M. 2. Morì 2. 23. Marzo, M.D.CCC.XLII. (Henry Beyle, Milanese, Wrote, Loved, Lived. 69 years and 2 months. He died at two A.M. on the 23rd March, 1842.)'

According to Beyle's own philosophical creed, which referred everything to self, he wrote, and loved, and lived in vain; for his writings were unprofitable, his loves were unprosperous, and his life was an unhappy one. It will not be uninteresting, nor beside the purpose, to trace and analyse the more recondite causes of these results.

Miss Edgeworth wrote the story of 'Murad the Unlucky,' to prove that what is popularly called ill-luck is simply another name for imprudence, and that we have commonly ourselves

to thank for our success or ill-success in life. Beyle's career might be plausibly adduced either for or against her argument. It was undeniably ill-luck that two dynasties should be successively upset just as he had established a claim on each respectively. His acknowledged merits very far exceeded those of many by whom he was distanced in the race; and on five or six occasions he strikingly distinguished himself, yet his good hits did little or nothing for his advancement. Fortune, therefore, clearly had something to do with his disappointments; yet we are disposed to think that his avowed incapacity for biding his time was the main cause of most of them. In the worldly struggle, passive endurance is no less useful than active energy; and patience under annoyance, or perseverance in uncongenial employments, has again and again proved ambition's best ladder. Beyle was the most impatient and least tolerant of human beings. Whenever an occupation ceased to interest him, he abandoned it; the moment his acquaintance failed to amuse, he fled from them. He deemed ennui the greatest of earthly evils, and a bore the worst of criminals. Armed with medical and legal authorities to the effect that death might be produced by ennui, and that the means by which it was illegally inflicted were immaterial in a juridical point of view, the Duc de Laraguais formally prosecuted a famous Parisian bore for an attempt upon his life. If Beyle had been the judge, he would have broken the accused upon the wheel without mercy or compunction. He was not wholly without excuse, for when suffering from ennui he underwent a complete prostration of his moral and physical faculties.

Another of his confirmed antipathies, if more excusable, was not less formidable as an obstacle or dangerous as a stumbling-block.

'Three or four times,' he writes, in his fifty-sixth year, 'fortune has knocked at my door. In 1814 it only rested with myself to be named Prefect of Mans, or Director-general of Corn Imports at Paris under the orders of Count Beugnot; but I was frightened at the number of platitudes and half-meannesses imposed daily on the public functionaries of all classes. . . . When I see a man strutting about in a room with a number of orders at his buttonhole, I involuntarily reckon up the number of paltry actions, of degrading submissions, and often of black treasons, that he must have accumulated to have received so many certificates of them.'

This may remind the reader of Selwyn's remark on a silver dinner-service, at the sale of the effects of Mr. Pelham, the Minister: 'How many toads have been eaten off these plates!'

Beyle rivalled or outdid Swift in his 'hate of folly' and his

‘scorn of fools,’ and took no pains to conceal his aversion or contempt. At the same time (like Sydney Smith with his ‘foolometer’) he fully appreciated the importance of this very numerous and very influential corporation. Thus, when maintaining the cause of the Romantic School against the Classicists, he says —

‘Never, in the memory of historians, did nation undergo in its manners and its pleasures a more rapid and entire change than that from 1780 to 1823, and people wish to give us the same literature ! Let our grave adversaries look round them ; the fool (*sot*) of 1780 produced stupid and insipid pleasantries ; he was always laughing ; the fool of 1823 produces philosophic reasonings,—vague, hackneyed, sleep-inspiring ; his face is constantly elongated. Here is a notable revolution. A society in which an element so essential and so abundant as the fool is changed to this extent, cannot support either the same comic or the same pathetic : then everybody aimed at making his neighbour laugh ; now everybody wishes to pick his neighbour’s pocket.’

We have already quoted his confession of an incurable tendency to produce enmity by his sarcasms. A man who habitually indulges in this mode of talking and writing may be esteemed for his manly spirit, his independent bearing, his moral and physical courage, or his uncompromising integrity, but he will rarely succeed as a place-hunter.

Beyle’s irreligion is not offensively paraded in the works published under his own eye in his lifetime ; but the lamentable state of his mind in this respect is most repulsively exhibited in three or four passages of the ‘*Correspondance Inédite*,’ where they have been inexcusably retained by the editor. His friend Mérimée describes him as a confirmed infidel and an ‘*outrageous materialist* ;’ nor, after fully allowing for his reckless habit of making himself appear worse than he was to shock grave people, can it be doubted that his entire mind and character were underlaid and pervaded by a cold, hard, ingrained and ineradicable system of disbelief. In the false pride of his mistaken logic, he fearlessly pushed his creed, or no-creed, to its extreme consequences. Denying Providence, he denied moral responsibility : and he regarded human beings as puppets, meant for nothing higher or better than to play a sorry or ridiculous part on the stage of life, where all their motions are regulated by the strings of egotism. According to Mérimée, he could never be persuaded that what he thought false, could be deemed credible by others ; and he put no faith in the sincerity of the devout. This extent of scepticism, assuming it to be genuine, implies a degree of blindness, of ignorance, of downright fatuity, that seems utterly irreconcilable with his proved

strength of understanding, his varied commerce with the world, and his acknowledged sagacity. To borrow the language which would have been best adapted to his apprehension, it was worse than a crime, it was a blunder. His assumed skill in penetrating to the springs of human action and his boasted logic, one or both of them, were at fault; and we need look no farther for the explanation of his disappointments or his despondency.

He is admitted on all hands to have been a man of strict honour and scrupulous integrity. M. Colomb adds, that few have had more devoted friends than Beyle, although he was culpably prone to neglect their interests as well as his own. This raises a fresh difficulty; for, generally speaking, no bad quality or vice carries its appropriate punishment along with it more surely than heartlessness. If we do not trust others, they will not trust us; and if we have no faith in friendship, we neither deserve nor acquire friends. What is worse, we forfeit our best source of consolation when we throw away hope; and we canker happiness in the bud when we kill enthusiasm:

‘ Like following life in creatures we dissect,
We lose it in the moment we detect.’

In one of Beyle's letters he speaks of himself as simultaneously conscious of two states of being,—the sentient and the observant or reasoning; and we can fancy him like the hero in ‘Used Up’ (*L'Homme Blasé*), who, in momentary expectation of a strong excitement, takes out his watch to count the beatings of his pulse. This constant practice of mental analysis may refine the perceptive powers, or sharpen the logical faculty, or supply materials for psychological study, but it chills the imagination, and induces an undue preference for sensual pleasures as the most solid or the least evanescent sources of enjoyment. Such was one of its effects on Beyle, who combined pruriency of fancy with delicacy of thought, and (no very rare occurrence) was at the same time sentimental and what the late Lord Alvanley used to call *fleshimental*. Another of its effects, not less marked, was to inspire him with a morbid dislike to poetry in verse, although he showed admirable discrimination in selecting beautiful passages from Shakspeare and Dante.

The reader will have observed that the combination of qualities which we have described in Beyle, belongs rather to the analytical than to the creative order of mind, and entitle their possessor to rank higher as a critic or metaphysician than as a writer of fiction. It is the very essence of sound criticism to trace impressions to their source; but the poet, the dramatist,

and the novelist (or writer of prose epics) must be swept along by the glowing stream of their own composition, or the public will look on indifferently or not notice them at all. In the case of the author before us, precisely what we should have anticipated from *à priori* reasoning, has come to pass. The only works of his which acquired any share of popularity on their first appearance were 'Rome, Naples, and Florence' (1817); 'Racine et Shakspeare' (1823); and the 'Life of Rossini' (1823). Beyle was passionately fond of music. When he wrote on it, he was hurried away by his subject; and the first of these three works may be described as a musical tour. The 'Life of Rossini' speaks for itself; and 'Racine and Shakspeare' was an exclusively critical production, thrown off upon a sudden impulse in the height of an exciting controversy. Such an occasion was eminently favourable to the display of his peculiar talents; and he was saved, in his own despite, from the fatal error of writing, or affecting to write, for a contemporary public of exceedingly narrow dimensions, or for a larger one that was to begin studying him in right earnest, and in a becoming spirit, about 1880.

It is stated in an English book of travels, printed for private circulation, that Manzoni, 'half in earnest, avowed it to be his creed, that as society became more enlightened, it would tolerate no such thing as literature considered merely as a creation of art.' Beyle too frequently acted on the hypothesis that this stage of progressive improvement had been reached already, or was sure to be reached very shortly; for he takes little pains to develop, or even to separate, his ideas, thoughts and images, when they crowd upon him. When the expression is irreproachable in respect of clearness, the odds are that the arrangement is faulty, or that the form is such as to create an inadequate impression of the work. We hardly remember another instance in which so much curious information and masterly criticism, so much varied and valuable matter of all sorts, is presented in so loose, scattered, unpretending, and unattractive a shape as in his 'Promenades dans Rome.' His friends allege that it was his dislike to Madame de Staël, and his horror of what he thought the sickly sentimentalities and pompous platitudes of 'Corinne,' that hurried him into the opposite extreme of putting forth two volumes of Notes.

'Whatever negligence may be found in his works,' says M. Mérimée, 'these were not the less laboriously worked up. All his books were copied several times before being delivered to the printer; but his corrections were not of style. He always wrote fast, changing his thought, and troubling him-

‘self little about the form. He had even a contempt for style, and maintained that an author had attained perfection when readers remembered his ideas without being able to recall his phrases.’ Just so it has been observed that the best dressed person is one who leaves a general impression of ease and elegance; or, as Brummel put it, if John Bull stops to look at you, you are not well dressed, but too stiff, too tight, or too fashionable. M. Thiers, again, in the eloquent Preface to his concluding volumes, compares a perfect style to glass which we look through without being conscious of its presence between the object and the eye. These respective points of excellence, however, are not attained when the dress conveys an impression of awkwardness, when the glass troubles the view, or when the style repels readers and degrades, instead of elevating, the thought. Nor are they often attained without labour; and it has been pointedly observed that the ‘Ramblers’ of Dr. Johnson, elaborate as they appear, were written rapidly and seldom underwent revision; whilst the simple language of Rousseau, which seems to come flowing from the heart, was the slow production of painful toil, pausing on every word, and balancing every sentence. Balzac concludes his fervent eulogy of Beyle by protesting against his ‘habitudes de sphinx;’ and says of the style of his best work, ‘he writes very much in the style of Diderot, who was not a writer; but the conception is grand and powerful, the thought is original, and often well rendered. This system is not to be held up to imitation. It would be too dangerous to let authors believe themselves profound thinkers.’ It would certainly be too dangerous to let them set up for so many Benthames, and depend upon a corresponding supply of Dumonts to translate or interpret them.

In a letter to M. Colomb, Balzac adds: ‘Beyle is one of the most remarkable spirits of the age; but he has not paid sufficient attention to form: he wrote as the birds sing, and our language is a sort of Madame Honesta, who finds no good in anything that is not irreproachable. I am deeply grieved at his sudden death; the pruning-knife should have been carried into the “Chartreuse de Parme,” and a second edition would have made a complete and irreproachable work of it. In any case it is a wonderful production, *le livre des esprits distingués*.’

Although not quite agreeing in this estimate, we concur with M. Balzac to the extent of thinking the ‘Chartreuse de Parme’ a very remarkable book, which may be fairly taken as Beyle’s masterpiece in the department of fiction. We shall, therefore,

endeavour to convey some notion of it by a rude outline of the plot and a few extracts.

The time is the first quarter of the present century. The scene is laid at Milan and Parma. The heroine (Gina, the abbreviation of Angelina) is a Milanese of high birth, surpassing beauty, indomitable energy, and morals of that elastic and accommodating order that never stand in the way of her preference or her caprice. The hero Fabricio, her nephew, is a good-looking, gallant, and gifted scapegrace, a sort of Italian Tom Jones, who is constantly getting himself and his patrons into difficulty by indulging the impulse of the moment. His aunt is attached to him with an intensity of affectionate interest that might have ended in a scandal of the worst kind, had it been reciprocated, which it is not; and she herself is represented as never wilfully cherishing an irregular or guilty wish. The most important of the *dramatis personæ*, after these two, are the reigning Prince of Parma, Ernest IV., and his prime minister, the Count Mosca della Rovere. More than a hundred pages are occupied in laying the train by details of Fabricio's youthful adventures and the early life of Nina, of which a single incident may suffice. Her husband, the Count Pietranera, having been killed in a duel, she intimates to her principal adorer her sovereign will and pleasure that he should pursue the successful combatant and revenge the death of her lost lord. He hesitates, and she sends him the following billet: —

‘Voulez vous agir une fois en homme d’esprit? Figurez-vous que vous ne m’avez jamais connue. Je suis, avec un peu de mépris peut-être, votre très humble servante,

‘GINA PIETRANERA.’

Refusing the most splendid offers, she takes up her abode in a fifth story, with the avowed intention of living on a pension of 1500 francs a year. The Count Mosca sees her at La Scala, and falls desperately in love with her. ‘He was then between forty and forty-five years of age: he had marked features, no appearance of pretension, and a gay, simple air, which predisposed in his favour. He would have been very good-looking still, if a whim of his prince had not obliged him to wear powder as a pledge of sound political opinions.’ He consoles himself for the advance of years by the reflection that ‘age, after all, is but the inability to give oneself up to those delicious tremblings and emotions;’ and, encouraged by the Countess’s smiles, he at length makes his proposals, which are not exactly what the French ladies call *pour le bon motif*. Like a late lamented English statesman, he explains that there

are three courses open. He would fling ambition to the winds, and live with her at Milan, Florence, or Naples, on the wreck of his fortune; or she might settle at Parma, where he could insure her a place about the Court—

“But,” he continues, “there is one capital objection. The prince is devout, and, as you are aware, it is my fate to be married. The result would be a million of annoyances. You are a widow; it is an excellent position which you must exchange for another, and this is the object of my third plan. A new and accommodating husband might be found. But it is essential that he should be of an advanced age, for why should you refuse me the hope of replacing him at some future day. Well, I have concluded this singular affair with the Duc Sanseverina-Taxis, who of course does not know the name of his future duchess. All he knows is that she is to make him ambassador, and confer on him a grand cross that his father had, and the want of which renders him the most miserable of mortals. Allowing for this weakness the Duc is not too much of a simpleton. He has his clothes and perukes from Paris. He is by no means the sort of man to commit intentional depravity; he seriously believes that honour consists in having a cross; and he is ashamed of his wealth. He came to me a year ago to propose to found a hospital to gain this cross. I laughed at him, but he did not laugh at me when I proposed a marriage; my first condition, I need hardly say, being that he should never set foot in Parma again.”

“But are you aware,” interrupted the Countess, “that what you are proposing to me is very immoral?”

“Not more immoral than what has been done in our Court and twenty others. There is this convenience in absolute power, that it sanctifies everything in the eyes of the governed; and can that which is seen by no one be a blot? Our policy, for twenty years, bids fair to consist in the fear of Jacobinism: and what a fear! Every year we shall fancy ourselves on the era of '93. You will hear, I hope, the phrases I am in the habit of declaiming on that topic, at my receptions. They are grand. Everything that may diminish this fear a little will be supremely moral in the eyes of the noble and the devout. Now, at Parma, everything that is not noble or devout is in prison or preparing to go there; and you may be well assured that this marriage will not appear singular amongst us before the day of my disgrace.”

Three months afterwards, the new Duchess Sanseverina Taxis was the cynosure of every eye and the observed of all observers at the Court of Parma, where the Prince, whose portrait is a masterpiece, soon seeks to displace and replace his minister. On one of her Thursday receptions, he could not resist the temptation of going in defiance of etiquette, and the following colloquy arises:

“But if I accept your Highness’s attentions,” observed the Countess, laughing, “with what face should I dare to reappear before the

Count?" "I should be almost as much out of confidence as you," replied his Highness. "The dear Count! my friend! But this is an embarrassment very easy to evade, and one on which I have been thinking,—the Count would be sent to the citadel for the remainder of his days."

She exerts her influence to make him pay a visit to his wife, an event which electrifies the Court —

"This Prince was not a wicked man; whatever the liberals of Italy may say of him. To be sure, he had thrown a good many of them into prison; but it was from fear; and he sometimes repeated, as if to console himself for certain reminiscences, that it is better to kill the devil than for the devil to kill us. The day after the *soirée* of which we have been speaking, he was in the highest spirits; he had done two good actions,—gone to the Duchess's Thursday, and spoken to his wife."

This rivalry of their confiding master and friend a little disturbs the domestic felicity of this exemplary pair, but still their grand cause of anxiety is Fabricio; and it is at length resolved between them that the proper vocation for a young man of family, suspected of liberalism and more than suspected of libertinism, is the Church. The young man refuses at first, but his scruples are overcome by an appeal to the example of his ancestors.

"What a mistake!" (he had thoughts of enlisting in the army of the United States), remonstrates his aunt. "You will see no war, and you will relapse into the tavern-life, only without elegance, without music, without love. Trust me, American life would be dull work for you or me." She explained to him the worship of the god dollar, and the respect that must be shown for the workpeople in the streets, who decide everything by their votes. "Before turning yourself into a policeman in uniform, reflect well that we are not talking of your becoming a poor priest, more or less virtuous and exemplary, like the Abbé Blanès (his tutor). Remember that your uncles were archbishops of Parma. Read over again the notices of their lives in the supplement to the genealogy. Above all, it becomes the bearer of an illustrious name to be *grand seigneur*, noble, generous, protector of justice, destined beforehand to find himself at the head of his order, and in all his life to be guilty of only one act of knavery, but that one very useful."

It was Talleyrand (whose choice of his original profession was probably influenced by similar considerations) who, when Rulhières said he had been guilty of only one wickedness in his life, asked 'When will it end?' There was more in this reprieve than its readiness or its point; for there are mean, wicked, and degrading actions which never do end, and which colour the entire current of a life. Fabricio, loose as he is,

has a vague instinct that he is about to commit one of these, but his scruples are overcome by the Duchess, and he consents with a sigh to become a Monsignore.

The Count's parting advice to his *protégé* is not quite equal to that given by Polonius to Laertes, but it is in strict keeping with the part.

"If we are dismissed," said the Duchess, "we will rejoin you at Naples. But since you accept, till the new order of things, the proposal of the violet stockings, the Count, who thoroughly understands Italy as it is, has charged me with an idea for you. Believe or disbelieve what you will be taught, but never raise an objection. Fancy to yourself that you are learning the rules of whist; would you raise objections to the rules of whist? I have told the Count that you are a believer, and he is glad of it; this is useful both in this world and the next. But if you believe, do not fall into the vulgarity of speaking with horror of Voltaire, Diderot, Raynal; and all those crackbrained Frenchmen, precursors of the two Chambers. Let those names be rarely in your mouth; but when you must speak of them, speak of them with calm irony: they are people who have been refuted long since, and whose attacks are no longer of any consequence. Believe blindly whatever you are told at the Academy. Reflect that your least objections will be noted down; you will be pardoned a little intrigue of gallantry well managed, but not a doubt: *age suppresses intrigue and augments doubt.*"

"The second idea that the Count sends you is this,—If you happen to think of a brilliant argument, a victorious *répétée*, which changes the course of the conversation, do not yield to the temptation of shining,—be silent; people of discernment will see your mental superiority in your eyes. It will be time enough to have *esprit* when you are a bishop."

How far Fabricio had benefited by these instructions may be inferred from his first interview with the Prince on the completion of his Neapolitan training for the priesthood:

"Well, Monsignor," began the Prince, "are the people of Naples happy? Is the King beloved?" "Serene Highness," replied Fabricio, without an instant's hesitation, "I admired, in passing through the streets, the excellent bearing of the soldiers of the different regiments of His Majesty; the good society of Naples is respectful towards its masters, as it ought to be, but I will fairly own that in all my life I never suffered people of the lower classes to speak to me of anything but the work for which I paid them." "*Peste,*" said the Prince to himself, "what unction! this is all in the Sans-severina style." Was it possible to repeat more closely the lessons of the aunt. I fancied I heard her speaking. If there was a revolution in my States, she would edit the "*Moniteur*," like the San-Felice at Naples. But the San-Felice, despite her beauty, and her twenty-five years, was hanged; a warning to over-clever ladies."

The Duchess narrowly escapes sharing the fate of La San Felice. The nephew kills a man in self-defence. He is accused of murder; and henceforth the main interest of the plot turns on the struggles of the aunt to save him from his persecutors who are secretly set on by the Prince, and to make him an archbishop in defiance of them. The most conspicuous among her adversaries is the minister of police, Rossi, and the least scrupulous of her tools is the republican enthusiast, Palla Ferrante, who robs on the highway to pay for the printing of his democratic tracts, and, whilst daily risking his life for liberty, is made the slave of an aristocratic beauty by a smile. Palla Ferrante, says Balzac, 'is the type of a family of Italian spirits, sincere but misled, full of talent but ignorant of the fatal effects of their doctrine. Send them, ye ministers of absolute princes, with plenty of money, to France (i. e. in 1840) and to the United States. Instead of persecuting them, let them enlighten themselves. They will soon say, like Alfieri in 1793, "The little at their work reconcile me to the great."' "

We agree with the same acute critic, that the commencement should have been abridged, and that the curtain should have fallen on the death of the Prince, although the loves of Fabricio and Clelia form one of the finest satires in the book. When the following interview takes place, Fabricio is archbishop of Parma, a popular preacher, and supposed (as is the lady) to be living in the odour of sanctity. He is admitted into an orangery, and finds himself before a barred window. A hand is extended to meet him, and a soft voice announces, *C'est moi*—

"I have made a vow to the Madonna, as you know, never to see you; this is the reason why I receive you in this profound darkness. I wish you to understand that if ever you force me to see you in broad daylight, everything between us will be at an end. But, in the first place, I do not choose you to preach before Anetta Marini."

"My angel, I will never preach again before any one. I only preach in the hope of seeing you."

"Do not speak thus; remember that it is not allowable for me to see you."

[Here we request permission to overleap a space of three years.]

The Marchioness had a charming little boy, about two years old, Sandrino, who was always with her, or on the knees of the Marquis, her husband. During the long hours, each day when she could not see her friend, the presence of Sandrino consoled her; for we have to confess a thing which will seem odd north of the Alps, she had remained faithful to her vow; she had promised the Madonna not to see Fabricio; such had been her very words, consequently she never received him but at night, and there was never a light in the apartment.

Balzac insists that the Count Mosca is meant for Prince Metternich, and that for Parma we should read Modena. Beyle denied that he had copied any living or contemporary original, male or female. He argues that his scene could not have been laid in one of the great courts on account of the details of administration. 'There remained the little princes of Germany and Italy. But the Germans are so prostrate before a riband, they are so *bêtes*. I passed many years amongst them, and have forgotten their language from contempt. You will see that my personages could not be Germana. If you follow this idea, you will find that I have been led by the hand to an extinct dynasty, to a Farnese, the least obscure of these extincts, by reason of the General, his grandfather.' . . . 'I have never seen Madame Belgioso. Rossi was a German. I have spoken to him a hundred times. I learnt "The Prince" during my residences at St. Cloud in 1810 and 1811.'

Schiller, in 'Cabal und Liebe,' and Lessing, in 'Emilia Galotti,' have each painted a petty despot, with the resulting demoralisation of all within his sphere; in still darker colours; but they wrote before the Great Revolution of 1789, which permanently altered the tone and limited the social effects of despotism, great or small. Although oppression and corruption may be as rife as ever, and iniquitous sentences may be procured as easily in the actual Naples as in the Parma of the novelist, the modern tools and satellites of tyranny are more rogues than fools; they are no unhesitating believers in right divine; their reverence for white staves and gold sticks is founded rather on calculation than on faith; and they no longer (except a few of the very silliest) talk of themselves, even amongst themselves, as privileged to indulge their vices at the expense of the non-noble classes with impunity. We doubt whether at any time since the commencement of the nineteenth century, a clever woman like the Duchess would have treated as an absurdity the notion of a del Dongo being prosecuted for killing ~~Galotti~~ Galotti, or whether any Pope within living memory would have been induced to sanction Fabricio's elevation to the archbishopric. Every objection of this sort, however, might have been obviated by carrying the plot back to the period when Dubois received his cardinal's hat, or even to that when Talleyrand was made a bishop, and when a gentleman was expected to suppress the insolence of the canaille by the infliction of instant death. Thus, Edgeworth relates in his 'Memoirs,' that once when he was riding with a lady in the south of France, some coarse expressions were addressed to her, or in her hearing, by a peasant.

whom Edgeworth forthwith horsewhipped and rolled into the ditch. Shortly afterwards he found himself coldly received by the aristocracy of the neighbourhood, and learnt, on inquiring the cause, that he was thought to have been wanting in proper spirit, and that it was his duty to run his sword through the fellow's body on the spot.

In the 'Promenades dans Rome,' and in the 'Correspondance Inédite,' may be found authentic examples by the dozen of crimes committed under the influence of jealousy, in which the criminal invariably had public opinion on his side. Beyle's experience of Italian society, as it existed in the first quarter of the present century, if not to the present day, had satisfied him that in Italy no offences against good feeling and morality were so unnatural as to lie altogether beyond the bounds of probability; and he constructed this singular tale from examples which had doubtless past before his eyes. But he has caricatured Italian depravity. Although parallels should be found for every individual act of villany, meanness, or immorality, there is no getting over the improbability or the repulsiveness of the universal corruption of the *dramatis personæ* as a whole. Not one of them has the smallest consciousness of a principle, or of a well-defined difference between right and wrong. The best, or (more correctly speaking) the least bad, are mere creatures of impulse; and it may fairly be made a question whether such a society could have been held together under such a government, even with a friendly and powerful despot to prop it up. In fact, Beyle seems to have invented a race of men and women to square with his own theory of materialism, and to have shaped his story with an exclusive view to their idiosyncrasy. Much ingenuity has been displayed in contriving forced scenes for the development of their peculiarities, whilst strokes of refined irony, witty remarks, and clever sketches, are found in sufficient number to give a tempting flavour to the book; but the plot drags and bewilders, and the characters inspire no interest, because they want vitality, and because (like Swift's Yahoos) they are an outrage on nature and on truth. The intended moral of the book is thus stated by the author:—

'From all this, the moral to be drawn is, that the man who approaches the court, compromises his happiness, if he be happy, and in every case makes his future destiny depend on the intrigues of a *femme de chambre*. On the other side, in America, in the republic, one must bore oneself all day long with paying serious court to the sleepers of the street, and become as stupid as themselves; and no opera!'

In the concluding sentence spoke the true genius, the mocking, penetrating, and Epicurean spirit of the man.

It is one of the common whims or tricks of Fame to reward the pioneers and champions of progress in an inverse ratio to their deserts. When their victory over error or prejudice is complete, the struggle is speedily forgotten, and their services, sometimes their very names, are forgotten too. The rising generation, who have been wont to regard the presence of Victor Hugo and Scribe among the illustrious Forty as a thing of course, and who have crowded to the Français to see Rachel in *Angelo* or *Adrienne Lecouvreur*, will find it difficult to believe that less than forty years since the armchairs of the Academy would have been deemed desecrated by such occupants and the national theatre profaned by such performances. But the fact was so, and the complete change which public opinion in France has undergone on this class of subjects is owing in no slight degree to Beyle; who, in the first grand assault on classicism, led the forlorn hope, and made himself honourably conspicuous by the glitter of his weapon and the vigour of his stroke. Mérimée awards him the honour of having, so to speak, discovered Italian music for the Parisian amateurs. Saint Beuve, another high authority, says that Beyle, after having smoothed the way for the due appreciation of Cimarosa, Mozart, and Rossini by the French, was equally successful in clearing the horizon for the brilliant galaxy of writers who, during the last quarter of a century, have formed the pride and ornament of literature in France. When he came to the rescue, the Romanticists were out-numbered and hard-pressed. Whoever dared to transgress the unities of time and place, or to depart in the slightest degree from the prescriptive standards of orthodoxy in language, morals, manners, or dramatic action, was hooted down or proscribed: whilst the Academicians, forming a compact body of literary policemen, and backed by the most influential journals, stood prepared to enforce or execute the decree. Their ground, however, was every way untenable, and they were soon thrown into confusion by the logic, sarcasms, and well-applied anecdotes of Beyle. At this distance of time from the controversy, a bare statement of the question will be enough.

‘Romanticism,’ says Beyle, ‘is the art of presenting a people with the literary works which, in the actual condition of their habits and modes of faith, are capable of affording them the greatest possible amount of pleasure. Classicism, on the contrary, presents them with the literature which afforded the very greatest possible amount of pleasure to their great-grandfathers.’

Then, after showing that the very dramatists set up as models for the moderns by the classicists, were essentially romanticists in their day, he continues:—

‘The Abbé Delille was eminently romantic for the age of Louis XV. His was poetry made for the people, who, at Fontenoy called, hat in hand, to the English, “Gentlemen, fire first.” That is certainly very noble, but how can such persons have the effrontery to say that they admire Homer? The ancients would have laughed outright at our notion of honour. And this poetry is expected to please a Frenchman who was in the retreat from Moscow.’

‘The romanticists do not advise any one to imitate directly the dramas of Shakspeare. What should be imitated in this great man is, the manner of studying the world in the middle of which we live, and the art of giving our contemporaries precisely the kind of tragedy of which they are in want; but which they have not the audacity to claim, terrified as they are by the reputation of the great Racine. By accident, the new French tragedy would strangely resemble that of Shakspeare. But this would be merely because our circumstances (in 1823) are the same as those of England in 1590. We also have parties, executions, conspiracies. That man, who is laughing in a salon whilst reading this pamphlet, will be in prison in a week. The other, who is joking with him, will name the jury that will find him guilty.’

It was by acting on this theory, by adroitly striking the chords in unison with the public mind, that, shortly afterwards, Alexandre Dumas attained the height of popularity by ‘Henri Trois’ and ‘Anthony,’ in which not only all the old stage proprieties, but proprieties which can never become obsolete, were systematically infringed.

The ‘Correspondance Inédite,’ on which we have already drawn largely for our biographical sketch, contains numerous specimens of criticism, observation, and description which go far towards justifying the estimate of the writer’s intimate friends when they pronounce him to be better than his books. Unluckily, most of his letters, like his controversial writings, relate to bygone topics, or to publications which have fallen into oblivion or quietly settled down into their proper places, and either way have ceased to inspire interest enough to give zest to a commentary. The following passages, however, possess the double attraction of being both pointed and characteristic. He is mourning over the extinct race of *grand seigneurs*.

‘I am not one of those philosophers who, when a heavy shower falls in the evening of a sultry day in June, are distressed by the rain, because it threatens injury to the crops, and, for example, to the blossoming of the vines. The rain, on such an evening, seems to me charming, because it relaxes the nerves, refreshes the air, and,

in a word, makes me happy. I may quit the world to-morrow: I shall not drink of that wine, the blossoms of which embalm the hillocks of the Cote d'Or. All the philosophers of the eighteenth century have proved to me that the *grand seigneur* is a very immoral, very hurtful thing; to which I answer that I am passionately fond of a grand seigneur,—high-bred and gay, like those I met in my family when I learnt to read. Society bereaved of these beings so gay, charming, amiable, taking nothing in the tragical vein, is, in my point of view, the year deprived of its spring.'

'I seek for pleasure every day, for happiness as I can. I am fond of society, and I am grieved at the state of consumption and irritation to which it is reduced. Is it not very hard on me, who have but a day to pass in an apartment, to find it just then occupied by the masons, who are whitewashing it, by the painters, who drive me away by the intolerable smell of their varnish; finally, by the carpenters, the noisiest of all, who are hammering away with all their might at the floor. All these vex that, but for them, the apartment would come down. Alas! gentlemen, why was it not my good luck to inhabit it the day before you set to work?'

Beyle's 'History of Painting in Italy,' which he transcribed seventeen times, fell still-born. His essay 'De L'Amour,' as we are candidly informed in the preface to the new edition, shared the same fate. Yet, despite his paradoxes and caprices, he must have been a very entertaining and instructive cicerone; and, too frequently imbedded in masses of broken thought and incomplete theory, more than one specimen of his happiest manner will be found in this neglected volume upon Love. Take, for example, the introductory part of the story, entitled 'Le Rameau de Salzbourg.'

'At the mines of Hallein, near Salzburg, the miners throw into the pits that have been abandoned a bough stripped of its leaves: two or three months afterwards they find it entirely covered with brilliant crystallisations. The smallest branches, those which are not larger than the claw of a titmouse, are incrustated with an infinity of little glancing and glittering crystals. The primitive bough is no longer to be recognised. The miners never fail, when the sun is bright and the air perfectly dry, to offer these branches of diamonds to the travellers who are about to descend into the mine.'

We omit the description of the party with whom the author visited these mines. All that it is necessary to know is, that one of his companions was a beautiful Italian.

'During our preparations for the descent, which were long, I amused myself with observing what was passing in the head of a good-looking fair-complexioned Bavarian officer of hussars, who, although very handsome, had nothing of the coxcomb about him, and on the contrary appeared to be an *homme d'esprit*; it was Madame Gherardi (familiarily called the Ghita) who made the discovery. I saw

him falling in love at first sight with the charming Italian, who was beside herself with pleasure at the thought of our soon finding ourselves five hundred feet underground, and was a thousand miles from the thought of making conquests. Before long I was astonished at the strange confidences which the officer made to me unconsciously. I warned Madame Gherardi, who, but for me, would have lost this spectacle to which perhaps a young woman is never insensible. What struck me most was the shade of insanity which unceasingly increased in his reflections. He kept finding in this woman perfections more and more invisible to my eyes. Every moment what he said painted with less resemblance the woman he was beginning to love. I said to myself, the Ghita cannot be the cause of all the transports of this poor German. For example, he began praising her hand, which had been affected in a singular manner by the small pox, and had remained very pitted and very brown.

‘How to explain what I see?’ said I to myself. Where find a comparison to elucidate my thought? At this moment, Madame Gherardi was playing with the branch covered with crystals which the miners had just given her. There was a bright sunshine: it was the third of August, and the little saline prisms shone as brilliantly as the finest diamonds in a well lighted ball-room. . . . I told the Ghita, ‘The effect produced upon this young man by the nobleness of your Italian features, by those eyes such as he never saw before, is precisely similar to that which the cry-tallisation has produced on the little branch which you hold in your hand and think so pretty. Stripped of its leaves by the winter, it was surely nothing less than dazzling. The cry-tallisation of the salt has covered the blackened bough with these diamonds, so brilliant and so numerous, that except in a few places we can no longer see the branches as they are.’

‘‘Well, and what is your conclusion?’’ said Madame Gherardi. ‘‘That this bough,’’ I replied, ‘‘faithfully represents the Ghita, such as she is seen in the imagination of this young officer.’’

‘‘That is to say, that you perceive as much difference between what I am in reality and the manner in which this amiable young man regards me, as between a little branch of dried elm and the pretty *aigrette* of diamonds which these miners have presented to me!’’

‘‘Madame, the young officer discovers in you qualities that we, your old friends, have never seen. For example, we should never perceive an air of tender and compassionate *bonté*. As this young man is a German, the first quality of a woman in his eyes is *bonté*, and forthwith he reads the expression of it in your face. If he was an Englishman, he would endow you with the aristocratic and ‘lady-like’ air of a duchess; but if he were I, he would see you such as you are, because for many a day, and to my misfortune, I can imagine nothing more fascinating.’’

The thought may have occurred to others, as when Congreve’s Mirabel says to Millamant,—‘You are no longer handsome when you have lost your lover; your beauty dies upon the instant: for beauty is the lover’s gift; ’tis he bestows your

'charms; your glass is all a cheat.' But the theory was never so fully developed, or so gracefully expressed, and Beyle's carelessness, as well as his unreasonableness in complaining of not being understood, may be estimated from the fact that this story, which is the keynote of the book, was discovered amongst his papers, and first appeared in the posthumous edition. He has an odd theory to account for the alleged insensibility of Englishwomen:

'In England the wealthy classes, tired of staying at home, and under pre-text of necessary exercise, complete their three or four leagues a day, as if man were created and placed on the globe to trot. In this manner they consume the nervous fluid by the legs and not by the heart. After which, forsooth, they presume to talk of feminine delicacy, and to despise Spain and Italy. Nothing, on the contrary, can be more free from occupation than the young Italians; the motion which would deprive them of their sensibility is disagreeable to them. They may walk half a league occasionally as a painful security for health: as to the women, a Roman beauty does not take in a year as much exercise as a young *miss* in a week.'

Beyle might have learnt that a young *miss* exercises her mind as well as her body; and it is a strange perversity of morals to claim the palm of 'feminine delicacy' for women, who (if we may trust their eulogist) are trained to become languishing or capricious mistresses instead of faithful wives or intellectual companions, and taught that intrigue, not duty, is and ought to be the chief business and grand object of their lives. We shall conclude our extracts with an anecdote and a shrewd remark.

'Ought not the true pride of a woman to be placed in the energy of the sentiment she inspires? The courtiers of Francis the First were joking one of the queen-mother's maids of honour about the inconstancy of her lover, who, they said, had no real love for her. A short time afterwards this lover was taken ill, and reappeared at court dumb. One day, at the end of three years, when the same persons were expressing their astonishment at her loving him still, she said to him, "Speak;" and he spoke.'

'It not unfrequently happens that a clever man, in paying court to a woman, has done no more than make her think of love, and pre-dispose her heart. She encourages this clever man, who gives her this pleasure. He conceives hopes. One fine day this woman meets the man who makes her feel what the other has described.'

It is a redeeming feature in Beyle's character, to be set against a host of errors, that, in what he terms his affairs of the heart, he was remarkable for the delicacy and depth of his feelings, and the constancy of his attachment. 'There was one woman,' says Mérimée, 'whose name he could never pro-

‘nounce without trepidation in his voice. In 1836 (he was then fifty-three) he spoke to me of his love with profound emotion. An affection, which dated very far back, was no longer returned. His mistress was growing reasonable, and he was as madly in love as at twenty. “How can you still love me?” she asked; “I am forty-five.” “In my eyes,” said Beyle, “she is as young as when we first met.” Then, with that spirit of observation which never left him, he detailed all the little symptoms of growing indifference that he had remarked. “After all,” he said, “her conduct is rational. She was fond of whist. She is fond of it no longer: so much the worse for me if I am still fond of whist. She is of a country where ridicule is the greatest of evils. To love at her age is ridiculous. During eighteen months she has risked this evil for my sake. This makes eighteen months of happiness that I have stolen from her.”’

Beyle, always too stout for elegance, grew corpulent as he advanced in years, and his portrait, as sketched by his friend M. Colomb, does not convey the impression of a lady-killer. But his brow was fine, his eye lively and penetrating, his mouth expressive, and his hand cast in so fine a mould that a celebrated sculptor applied for permission to take a cast of it for a statue of Mirabeau.

The utmost space we feel justified in devoting to this remarkable man is exhausted, and we cannot now notice any other of his works. We will merely add one observation which is equally applicable to all of them. They belong preeminently to what he calls the class of insolent works, which require and compel readers to think; and if (as many apprehend) the prevalent fashion for cheap literature should end by deteriorating the article and lowering the popular taste, there will be some comfort in reflecting that it has occasionally rescued from unmerited neglect the name and writings of a man of thought, observation and sensibility, like Beyle.

- ART. IX, — 1. *The Isthmus of Suez Question.* By FERDINAND DE LESSEPS, Minister Plenipotentiary. London: 1855.
2. *Essais par MM. Baude. et Tulabot sur le Canal de Suez. Revue des deux Mondes.* Livraisons du 15 Mars et 15 Mai, 1855.
3. *The Dead Sea a new Road to India, &c.* By Captain W. ALLEN, R. N. London: 1855.

IT is scarcely possible for any one to study the map of the world, with reference to the commercial communications between remote nations, without being seized with the desire to cut through the two narrow isthmuses of Darien and Suez, which seem to offer such feeble barriers to the most important lines of intercourse.

Ever since Nunez de Bilboa first saw the Southern Ocean from the heights above Darien—from 1513 to the present day—innumerable schemes have been proposed for joining the two oceans, and avoiding the long and dangerous navigation round the Horn. There the distance is under forty miles, or less than half that of the Isthmus of Suez, but the summit level is everywhere so high, the ridge so rocky, and it is so difficult to obtain water for the higher levels of a canal, that the project has hitherto baffled even the energy of Transatlantic engineers. There can, however, be little doubt but that it is only a question of expense; and if railroads will not suffice for the traffic between the two oceans a canal must and will be cut: but, as the question at present stands, it seems more than probable that railroads will be found sufficient, and thus the expensive and uncertain project of a ship canal will be indefinitely postponed.

The case is widely different—at first sight, at least—as regards the Isthmus of Suez. The distance, it is true, is greater, being above ninety miles between the two seas, but the land is low and sandy, a great part below high-water mark, and there are only two ridges in the whole distance, one fifty, the other fifty-five, feet above the same point; and, as neither are of very great extent, they could easily be cut down to the general level. The great argument, however, in favour of this proposal is, that a water communication has existed between the two seas at various intervals during the last three thousand years; and it is argued that what could be accomplished by the imperfect science of the ancients must be a trifle to the improved engineering skill and knowledge of the present day.

The project for joining the two seas by a canal received an immense impulse from the French expedition to Egypt at the end of the last century. The object with which it was undertaken was not merely to obtain possession of the land of the ancient Pharaohs. It was to be a stepping-stone to the conquest of the East. Once master of Egypt and Syria, Napoleon's idea was, that he should be near enough to succour the Mysore and Maharatta chiefs in their struggle with the British forces, and trusting to his own genius, he hoped to accomplish the expulsion of the English from India, which his countrymen had so nearly succeeded in effecting less than half a century before that time. Once master of India and of Egypt, the whole commerce of the East was to be turned from the route by the Cape, through the channel of the Red Sea into the Mediterranean. Alexandria and Marseilles were to become the great emporia of its trade; and, backed by the wealth of India and the energy of France, the conquest of the rest of the world seemed easy and assured. These may now appear to be wild schemes; but they were hardly more wild than those that led to the campaigns of Germany and of Moscow, and so nearly laid all Europe at the feet of one man. These visions of conquest have now passed away; but, as commercial ideas, they were not only shared by his countrymen at the time, but even now prevail to a very great extent in France. Numerous projects have been put forward by Frenchmen for the canalisation of the Isthmus; and all opposition on the part of Englishmen is most erroneously ascribed either to commercial jealousy or political apprehension. Such being the case, it cannot be devoid of interest to inquire a little more calmly than has hitherto been done, how far the proposal for cutting a canal through the Isthmus is really feasible, and what would be its result commercially and politically if effected. As far as political motives are concerned, we can conceive no policy more absurdly illiberal than that which should seek to close one of the great avenues of the trade of mankind to suit some fanciful theory of rival influence; and we entirely repudiate any such sentiment in these observations, as utterly unworthy of ourselves and of this country.

The result of the levellings carried across the Isthmus, under the direction of the French savans in 1799, was the extraordinary statement that the level of the Mediterranean was thirty feet below that of the Red Sea at Suez; and all the projects for canals had, up to a very late date, been based on this assumption. It had generally been supposed that it would be sufficient to make a

small cutting of sufficient depth, and that the power of the current would do the rest. Men of science doubted the possibility of this difference of level, on cosmical grounds; and the best engineers saw that if it were so the canal must either assume the dimensions of a strait—a Bosphorus, as some one expresses it,—or that it must be a salt river, wide, shallow, and encumbered with sand banks in some places, and deep and rapid where the soil was firmer; but in either way totally unfit for navigation by large vessels.

All these speculations were put a stop to by a new series of levels executed in 1847. At this period a Commission was appointed from the three nations most interested in the question to examine its capabilities on the spot. In this Congress Mr. R. Stephenson, the engineer of the Menai Bridge, represented England, M. Talabot, a thoroughly competent engineer, was appointed for France, and M. Negrelli for Austria. The first result of their explorations was to ascertain that the level of the two seas was the same; but as there is a tide of about six feet six inches in the Red Sea, and of only eighteen inches in the Mediterranean, it follows that the mean level of the Red Sea is nearly three feet higher than in the Mediterranean. As these results were very much doubted when first announced, a new series of levels was carried from sea to sea in 1853; and as these only differed about seven inches from the preceding, the question may be considered as practically set at rest.

After a very short examination, Mr. Stephenson satisfied himself that the idea of a canal was impracticable, and gave his whole mind and energies to the construction of a railroad, which is now nearly complete from Alexandria to Cairo, and is being proceeded with under French engineers from Cairo to Suez.

M. Negrelli seems to have been in favour of a canal, but has not published any detailed scheme of the manner in which he would propose to construct it. M. Talabot, on the other hand, is not only exclusively in favour of a canal, but has published his proposals in the '*Revue des Deux Mondes*' in quite sufficient detail to enable us to understand them.

Before these papers appeared, however, M. Ferdinand de Lesseps, a gentleman formerly connected with Egypt in a diplomatic character, and a personal friend of Mohammed Said, the present Pasha, obtained from him the concession of the line for a canal from Suez to Tinch, the ancient Pelusium, the nearest point on the Mediterranean. This concession was accompanied by a solemn declaration on the part of the Pasha, that 'he would not authorise any track which shall have its point of departure on the Mediterranean coast to the westward of the Damietta

'Branch, and which shall traverse the course of the Nile.' Were the decree of the Pasha final in these matters, this would appear at once to exclude the scheme of M. Talabot, which terminates at Alexandria, and might limit our inquiries to the examination of the proposals of M. de Lesseps. If, however, either of these projects were as feasible as their authors suppose, or if one-tenth part of the advantages they claim could result from them, the governments of Western Europe, and more especially that of England, would be perfectly justified in insisting that no obstacle should be thrown in the way of a work which, if completed, would be not only of the greatest benefit to the civilised world, but would add also, in an incalculable degree, to the prosperity and importance of Egypt itself.

Having obtained the concession, M. de Lesseps secured the services of Messrs. Linant Bey and Mougel Bey, two French engineers who had long been in the service of the Pashas of Egypt. They furnished him with a detailed report of the engineering works, with estimates of the expense, and of the probable commercial results; all of which are embodied in his pamphlet and adopted by him as his basis of operations.

The proposal of these gentlemen is simple enough: it is, to dig a canal 90 miles in length, 330 feet wide at the water line, and the bottom of which shall be 20 feet below the level of low water in the Mediterranean. A sluice lock, 330 feet long by 70 wide, is to be placed at each end, and by taking advantage of the rise of the tides at Suez it is expected that an additional depth of 3 to 4 feet may be obtained throughout.

The expense of excavating what is above the level of the sea is taken at the low rate of $4\frac{1}{2}d.$ per cubic yard. It is proposed to raise what is below that level by means of steam dredges; and the operation is calculated to cost two millions sterling (50,054,674*f.*), or at the rate of $6\frac{3}{4}d.$ per cubic yard. In this country, where coals are certainly far cheaper, and steam machinery much more economically worked and kept in repair, it is found that such an operation cannot be performed under 1*s.* per cubic yard—a correction that would add more than a million and a half to this item alone. But this is a trifling objection. The canal could be cut, and probably for four or five millions sterling.*

* It is said that some recent borings on the line of the canal have revealed the presence of rock very near the surface in some places. If this be true, it is a most favourable circumstance; for though it would no doubt add considerably to the expense to have to cut a canal

The two great works on this line are the artificial harbours it is necessary to construct at the two ends of the canal. That at Suez does not seem to present any serious engineering difficulty. The sea there is so narrow as to be free from any heavy swell, and the quarries are close at hand. The length of the two piers is assumed to be $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles each; whereas the best charts show that they would require to be at least $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles long to reach the depth required. But it is ridiculous to put down the expense of such a work at 560,000*l.*; for the experience of the works we have constructed, and are now constructing on various points of our coasts, prove that breakwaters cost about that amount per mile; and though, it is true, they are generally placed in deeper water, yet as these at Suez are to lie in loose shifting sands, they may require as great an amount of material. It must be recollected, besides, that the country around is a barren desert, and that every mouthful of food the workmen consume, almost every drop of water they drink, must be brought from the valley of the Nile eighty or ninety miles off, and that all their machinery and every piece of timber, however small, must be brought from foreign countries — circumstances which would probably render the operation more expensive in the Red Sea than it is in this country.

The great work, however, by which the practicability of this scheme must finally be tested, is the formation of a harbour at Tinch (the ancient Pelusium) in the Mediterranean. If this cannot be accomplished, the whole falls to the ground. If it can, it is merely a question of expense. To understand the true bearings of the question, it is necessary to remember that the Nile annually brings down an immense amount of sediment, estimated at between forty and fifty millions of cubic yards. About one-fifth of this deposit is supposed to remain in the delta, the rest is borne to sea. At the same time, a current sets continually from the westward, past the mouths of the Nile, which carries nearly the whole of this alluvium into the bay or bight between the old Pelusiac mouth and Jaffa. The consequence is, that the whole of the coast is low and shelving, and the sea, full of shifting mudbanks, is dangerous in the extreme for the approach of large vessels.

According to the soundings taken with great care by the

of the dimensions described through the living rock; still the presence of stone so much nearer Pelusium than Suez would materially diminish the expense of constructing the harbour in the Mediterranean, which is the great difficulty of the undertaking, and would also lead to the belief that a foundation might be obtained for the moles, which must otherwise be wanting.

German engineers attached to the Commission of 1847, a depth of twenty-four feet is to be found only at a distance of about four miles from the shore; but to obtain a depth sufficient to allow vessels drawing twenty-three feet water to approach in safety in all weathers, it would be necessary to extend the pier of the proposed harbour at least five miles from the shore. If the bottom of the sea in this place were either rock, or clay, or any hard and firm substance, it would be a mere matter of calculation to ascertain how many cubic yards of loose stones would be required to form the moles; but as it is either loose sand, or still looser mud, it is impossible even to guess at the amount that would be required. At present, no rock or hard stratum is known to exist (unless the recent borings have discovered it) within seventy or eighty miles of the place; and the depth of the loose deposit may in consequence be eighty feet, or eighty fathoms, or twice that quantity, and if the sand were quick, or the mud loose, to any great extent, mountains might be poured into the gulf before the harbour was made. At Cherbourg, the *digue*, a work of far smaller dimensions, has been in course of construction from 1783 to the present day, and is said to have cost 16,000,000*l.* sterling, though the granite coast of the Cotentin affords abundant materials for the undertaking.

The pier would require to be of uniform height throughout, for though the inner end might be supposed to rest on the shore in the first instance, the moment the mud and sand were dredged away in front of it, it would of course sink to the level of the bottom of the canal, even if it stopped there. This circumstance appears to have been overlooked in the estimates, and, added to the increased length necessary from M. Talabot's details, it is more than probable that these piers would require eight millions of cubic metres of stone, instead of the two millions allowed for them in the estimates. But this is not all; every stone to be used in their construction is, according to M. de Lesseps, to be brought from the quarries behind Suez, a distance of ninety-six miles from the place where they are to be used, and this it is assumed can be done at the rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* per ton per mile. In this country, where mineral traffic is merely a supplement to that of passengers and goods, it is found that it cannot be carried on profitably under 1*d.* and 1*½d.* per ton; and when the whole expense of making the railroad, of the plant, and of working, is to be borne by one article, it is not conceivable that it could be done for less; yet these corrections would make a difference of five or six millions sterling in the estimates, always supposing the bottom of the sea at Tineh to be sound and capable of bearing the weight laid upon it.

M. de Lesseps and his engineers seem to be aware that nothing so magnificent has been attempted in Europe, for after a slight allusion to the works at Cherbourg, Plymouth, and elsewhere, we have the following startling piece of information :

‘With regard to the possibility there can be no doubt, for more than a century ago the Dutch Government constructed a jetty 8000 metres (nearly six miles) in length in the Bay of the Lion, near the Cape, in water more than sixteen metres deep, in spite of the continuous tempestuous weather which succeeds the settled calms in these latitudes. Such a work, considering the depth of water, must have required a quantity of materials at least four times as great as that required for the two jetties and the mole at Pelusium. It was undertaken by a nation not over rich, at a time when steam was unknown, and before the invention of machinery, which saves so much time, expense, and labour. There can be no doubt, therefore, that if the cutting of the Isthmus is admitted to be advantageous, it will be easy to overcome all difficulties.’

So important does this example appear that we find it again alluded to, in the following terms, by the writer of an article in the ‘*Moniteur*,’ in favour of M. de Lesseps’ scheme : —

‘But are jetties of a league and a half into the sea possible? or are they indeed a work that cannot be executed? The answer to this question is easy. A hundred years ago the Hollanders, not so rich and not so skilful as we are now, although quite as bold, erected at the Cape in the Bay of the Lion, at a depth of sixteen metres, in spite of the most frightful tempests, a breakwater of 8000 metres; that is, a work at least four times the extent of that required for the entrance of the Canal at Pelusium.’

Nothing can more fitly describe the whole argument of M. de Lesseps than these quotations. If he knows where the Bay of the Lion is, we do not; and though the English have possessed the Cape for half a century, and explored it with tolerable energy, they have failed to discover this mole or any trace of its previous existence. As we shall presently show, had it ever been constructed, it would have been of more service to the trade of the East than the jetties of Pelusium, for hundreds of our best ships and of our bravest seamen have perished on that inhospitable shore for want of such protection. But as we believe this statement to be altogether erroneous and unfounded, we shall be glad to learn M. de Lesseps’ authority for making it.

The scheme of M. Talabot, as might be expected from a thoroughly educated French engineer of the first class, is a far more practical nature, and meets fairly the whole difficulties of the case. It is based on the knowledge that Egypt never did possess any harbour in the Mediterranean, except

that of Alexandria, which was capable of admitting large vessels; and being perfectly convinced of the impracticability of forming a harbour at Pelusium, M. Talabot assumes that it would be absolutely indispensable to carry the canal across the whole width of the Delta. It is true this would necessitate its being nearly three times the length of the direct line, or 256 miles instead of 90; but this is a calculable quantity, and leads to an excellent harbour, whereas the possibility of a northern outlet for the other cutting is quite problematical.

M. Talabot proposes another improvement, which is to carry the canal behind Suez to a point six or seven miles farther down the Red Sea, where deep water is found close in shore, and a small mole would suffice to protect the harbour. It is true that cutting the canal through the rocky ridges behind the town, and forming this harbour in deep water, might be nearly as expensive as the mode proposed by M. de Lesseps, but it is much more certain, and the result would be more satisfactory. From this point M. Talabot proposes to carry the canal along the line of the bed of the old canal of the Pharaohs, a distance of 135 miles, to a spot on the Nile just above the bifurcation of the Delta. Crossing the river it winds along the edge of the cultivated land to Alexandria, a distance of above 120 miles. The dimensions of this canal are about the same as those proposed for the other. The locks are to be 330 feet long, 70 feet wide, and deep enough to admit vessels drawing 26 feet of water. The bottom of the canal is to be 130 to 165 feet wide, according to the nature of the soil. As the mean level of the Nile at Cairo is 60 feet above that of the two seas, each branch would require six of these locks or twelve altogether. It may assist us in estimating the magnitude of this work, to bear in mind that the Caledonian Canal, the largest ship canal in existence, is a cutting of little more than 23 miles in extent; its locks are only 170 feet long by 40 wide, the depth of the canal is only 15 feet, and the width at bottom only 50 feet. The Egyptian Canal is therefore ten times as long, and as doubling the other dimensions increases the expense in more than a quadruple ratio, though the one has only twelve locks and the other twenty-three, it may safely be asserted that the Suez Canal is a work of twenty times the magnitude of the Caledonian. The latter cost the English Government a million sterling, and the expense of keeping it in repair is so enormous, that it was seriously proposed, a few years ago, to abandon it.*

The Caledonian Canal is almost an exactly parallel one to that at Suez. Looking merely at the map, its advantages appear

It may be said that the ground is much more suitable for canal digging in Egypt than in Scotland; but till borings have been made all along the line of the canal, this is by no means so clear as it might at first sight appear; in many parts the canal may leak to an inconvenient extent, and it must be a work of enormous difficulty in such a soil to obtain a secure foundation for such enormous works and locks as are proposed.

The great difficulty of the undertaking, however, is the passage of the Nile. In no part of its course is the river deep enough to allow of vessels drawing 25 or 26 feet water to cross from shore to shore. M. Talabot suggests that when the 'barrage' is completed, it may dam up the waters to a sufficient depth for the purpose. But this result can be only momentary; for, as every one who has been on the Nile knows, its waters at all seasons contain an immense amount of sediment; and it only requires that they should be allowed to stand about half an hour for this matter to be deposited and the water to become potable. It was the conviction that this would be the case that caused the works of the barrage to be abandoned after such immense sums of money had been expended upon them; for the clear water of the Nile would have no fertilising power, and the sediment would have been deposited behind the barrage until the bed was raised to just such a height as would admit of the passage of the water of the river. The mean depth would consequently have been exactly the same as before, but evenly distributed over the whole width, and no conceivable amount of dredging would make a deepwater channel there and keep it permanently open.

Another grave difficulty arises from the fact that the waters of the Nile are, at one season of the year from 18 to 26 feet higher than they are at another; and it would be extremely difficult to regulate the entrance locks so as to meet levels

self-evident, and nature seems to have executed half the work, as if only to tempt man to complete it. When it was proposed, everyone thought that all the trade between Denmark and the Baltic ports would choose this straight and safe navigation rather than brave the storms and dangers of the circuitous route round Cape Wrath and through the Orkneys and Hebrides. The result has shown how mistaken these calculations were. A few steamers to accommodate tourists and an occasional fishing smack are all that avail themselves of it. But so little is it capable of paying its expenses, that when the question was debated in the Commons the whole reason of the House was in favour of closing it, but the feelings of the members saved it. It was felt to be a disgrace to allow so splendid a work to go to decay, and it is now supported out of the imperial revenues. Would that of Egypt be as fortunate?

varying not only from month to month, but from year to year. These and other difficulties, which need not be recapitulated, convince M. Talabot that the level crossing is nearly impracticable; and he therefore proposes what really seems to be the only possible mode of getting over the difficulty—viz., by an aqueduct, the surface of the water in which is to be raised 40 feet above the level of the high water of the Nile, and 60 feet above the low-water level. This huge edifice is to be 3300 or 3500 feet in length, of the same section as the locks, and to be reached by four locks at each end, forming a sort of giant stairs, by ascending which the summit level is to be attained by the largest line-of-battle ships!

It is somewhat humiliating to us islanders, who have been childish enough to wonder at the boldness that designed the Menai tubes or the Saltash Bridge, or have believed that the Montreal Viaduct would really be a great work, to find our greatest undertakings so far outdone, and what we should deem the wildest conceptions soberly submitted for our acceptance as a commercial speculation. The aqueduct would be a fit anticlimax to the long series of wonderful works which still adorn the valley of the Nile, beginning with the Great Pyramid in the immediate neighbourhood. That was erected, some 5000 years ago, to gratify the vanity of kingly pride; and this, the greatest wonder of the modern world, to satisfy the utilitarian exigencies which are as characteristic of our commercial age.

It is, however, not only necessary to build this great aqueduct, but, when built, to supply it with water; and as every vessel passing through, however small, would abstract two lock-fulls of water from the great central trough, the amount required is something enormous. It would be impossible to procure this, at a height of 60 feet above the level of the river, by means of an alimentary canal, leaving the Nile at any reasonable distance higher up; and it is therefore proposed to supply it by steam power. And it is suggested that engines of 600 or 800 horse power would suffice for this: perhaps they would, if working night and day to fill reservoirs placed on higher levels; but the expense of these engines, with the pipes of communication and other hydraulic works, would be so enormous, that it seems almost useless to attempt to calculate it.

The whole project, like that of M. de Lesseps, is set down as executable for 8 millions sterling; and it is needless to suggest that it would cost 10 or 12 millions, as it is equally likely to cost 10 or 20. But the work can be done; no doubt; and, if it would

pay, there is no reason why 20, or even 100, millions should not be spent upon it. As it is merely a question of traffic, we shall be better able to see whether it is necessary to go minutely into the estimates, when we have ascertained what amount of shipping is likely to pass through it, which we shall attempt to do presently. In the meantime we would merely remark, *en passant*, that neither M. de Lesseps nor M. Talabot furnish us with any data for estimating the working expenses of the canal, nor the cost of repair, and such like expenses. But it is evident that the establishment of horses necessary to drag ships of two or three thousand tons burthen along such a canal, must be immense, supposing the speed to be $3\frac{1}{4}$ miles an hour, or say, 35 miles a day. Or, if steam-tugs were used, they must be very numerous and very powerful, as they cannot go into the same lock with large vessels; and there must either be one for each level, or the delay and expense of water will be very great.

To keep these enormous locks in repair must cost a very large sum; and as we know that the resources of Egypt have hardly been equal to keeping open the little canal of Alexandria, which is, in consequence, virtually closed at present, it is difficult to guess how these expenses are to be borne. Add to this the expense of dredging required for a canal wholly supplied with Nile water, expense of superintendence, &c. Every one may rate these items at what he pleases; but, assuming them at half a million annually, if half the number of ships now employed to the eastward of the Cape were to pass both ways through the canal, they would not suffice to pay the working expenses of the undertaking. It must also be borne in mind that everything in these works must be done by Europeans. The available population or resources of Egypt could not execute such a work in a hundred years. An army of foreign navvies will be required to keep in repair such a work, with its locks, viaducts, steam-engines, and a floating capital hardly inferior to the original outlay.

Although these gigantic schemes seem so utterly impracticable, it is by no means intended to assert that the canalisation of the Isthmus is not a possible or even a feasible idea; on the contrary it seems tolerably certain that it would be easy to cut a canal from the Damietta branch of the Nile to Suez, and that a very little piling and dredging at either end would render it accessible to vessels of from 300 to 400 tons burthen. Such a canal would suffice for all the wants of Egypt, and for all the local traffic of the two seas, and would therefore confer inestimable benefits on the whole Turkish empire, though it would

not touch the grand commerce of the world, which now follows the route round the Cape.

There is still a third scheme for forming a water communication between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, which must be briefly described before we leave this part of our subject. It is that proposed by Captain W. Allen of the Royal Navy, and though it goes far to redeem the English nation from the reproach of not being able to conceive designs as gigantic as the harbour at Pelusium, or the aqueduct over the Nile, this suggestion seems to be so utterly impracticable, that it is fortunate that neither Captain Allen's well-earned reputation, nor the success of his clever and entertaining volumes, depend on the feasibility of the project.

His proposal is based on the knowledge we now possess that the level of the Dead Sea is at least 1,300 feet below that of the Mediterranean or Red Seas, and that the Sea of Galilee is in like manner depressed to the extent of about 650 feet; so that the mean level of the valley of the Jordan, with its two lakes, may be taken at 1000 feet below the neighbouring seas and its extent as covering about 2000 square miles. This vast area Captain Allen proposes to convert into a great inland sea by cutting a canal from Acre across the plain of Esdraëlon to the Jordan, a distance of about 40 miles on the map, and another from Akabah, on the Red Sea, to the southern limit of the Dead Sea, a distance of about 120 miles.

The summit level of the plain of Esdraëlon may be as low as 100 feet above the level of the sea, or as high as 200, and from the appearance of the banks of the brook Kishon, near its junction with the sea, and the hills that bound the plain on both sides, the ground certainly is rocky nearly throughout its whole extent at a small distance below the surface. The proposal, therefore, is to dig a canal through a rocky country for 30 or 35 miles in length, and with a mean depth of 80 to 100 feet. It will not suffice merely to loosen the rocks with gunpowder, as Captain Allen proposes, and let the water do the rest, for the simple reason that water cannot remove rocks *in situ*, or even loose stones of any great size. The Nile, the Rhine, and Niagara have chafed for countless ages against the rocks that obstruct their courses, and the process of abrasion is so slow that man can hardly measure it. As there is no reason to suppose it would be more rapid here, the whole of the rocks *in situ* must be removed by man to the full depth and width of the proposed canal. We need hardly stop to estimate the cost of this operation, as there is a still greater difficulty to be overcome at the other end. Here neither the watershed nor the

summit level have been correctly ascertained ; but according to the Count de Bertou, whose observations are the best we possess, the summit level lies somewhere about 40 miles north of the Gulf of Akabah, and exceeds 500 feet in height above the level of the sea ; and as the slope from this point appears to be about equal both ways, the canal may be described as 70 or 80 miles in length, with a mean depth of 300 feet, allowing, of course, for a slope sufficient to induce the water to run through it. As far as can be gathered from the description of travellers, the valleys are bounded by perpendicular cliffs on both sides, and the whole country seems composed of calcareous and other rocks, covered in places with loose sand, almost as difficult to deal with as rocks in canal digging. With such dimensions as those above quoted, even Captain Allen would be inclined to give up his favourite scheme ; but as he suggests the summit level may be lower, let us assume it to be 150 or 200 feet, and consequently the mean depth of the canal for the 80 miles at 100 feet. The sand would have to be removed to an angle at which it would stand, and as in the former instance, the rocks would have to be cleared away to the full extent required for the canal.

But even this would not suffice ; for if a passage were only opened of say 100 feet in width by 30 in depth below the level of the sea, the water that would pass through would not fill up the basin of the Dead Sea in 100 or indeed in 1000 years. Assuming the dimensions and depths above given, we may calculate the number of cubic yards of water that would be required ; and taking the discharge of the Mississippi at 30,000 cubic yards a second, and of the Niagara at about half that quantity, it is easy to see that it would take the first-named river about $2\frac{1}{2}$ years, the last-named 5 years, to bring up the Dead Sea to the level of the other seas. As far as time is concerned this is of little consequence, but it is a serious undertaking to provide a bed in a rocky country for such a stream ; and such a body of water flowing through a new country for such a time would make itself a channel very unlike what an engineer would desire for ship navigation. Where the soil is loose and sandy it would be two or three miles in width and shallow in proportion, and where it is rocky, deep, and rapid, the current would form cataracts and throw up sandbanks where these had spent their strength ; and it would require an enormous amount of straightening and dredging after the great object was gained before even the smallest vessel could pass through it.

But this is not all. The Jordan, though a considerable

stream, is just sufficient to balance the evaporation from the surface of the Dead Sea; and if that sea were increased to five or six times its superficial area, as is proposed, it would require four or five such rivers as the Jordan, in addition to the one we now have, to supply the deficiency; and this body of water must be introduced, either two Jordans from the Mediterranean, and two from the Red Sea, or all four from either end; whichever mode is adopted, such a body of water flowing through any canal is quite sufficient to eat away the banks and disturb the bottom. Such a river would inevitably do for itself, in a very short time, what every other river in the world has done for itself; it would make its bed exactly of that width and of that depth which is sufficient for the passage of its own waters, and in this instance, that would not suffice for the passage of a vessel of 50 or 100 tons. The only mode by which this difficulty could be got over, would be either to establish weirs and locks along the whole length, or to line the bottom and sides of the canal with masonry so solid as to resist the action of the waters. As either proposal is absurd, it is useless to insist on the difficulty of executing such a work in a country where if the whole population for 100 miles round were collected together, they could not carry it on in any conceivable time, where the climate is so hot that Europeans cannot work, at least for the greater part of the year, and where all food and all water must be brought from a distance of at least 100 miles. It would be easy to multiply objections of this sort; but the above may suffice to show that though the agitation of this question may conduce to our knowledge of the physical geography of the globe it is not likely, in our time at least, to assist the commercial activity of nations. Before leaving it, however, it may be as well to allude to one other point, from its general bearing on the whole question of the communication between the two seas.

The officers appointed by the East India Company to survey the Red Sea, in speaking of the Gulf of Akabah, say that —

‘This part of the Red Sea, so little known formerly, has now been found to afford no advantage for a sailing ship; the advantages which it might offer for steamers, in landing their packets at Akabah, is in a measure counteracted by the almost constant and violent northerly winds which prevail here. These winds are drawn to the southward by a very high range of mountains, bounding close both sides of the sea, and opening like a funnel to the northward in Syria; from which cause the cooler atmosphere of the northern regions is drawn into this part with such violence that it raises the sea into a deep and turbulent swell, so that no vessel could make way against it. The place also is void of soundings and anchorages, except at one

or two spots. No native vessels ever navigate this sea; and such a dread have they of this place, that in crossing the Red Sea near the Sea of Akabah, the Arabs always offer up a prayer for their safety. Numerous vessels have been lost hereabouts; and when trying to survey it, four attempts were made before we succeeded, in the Honourable Company's surveying vessel "*Palinurus*," having been blown away three different times, once at anchor, having two bowers down with fifty fathoms of chain each.'

From this it appears that, even if the communication were open, it would be entirely useless for sailing vessels, and difficult of approach even by steam-boats; and as the same is true to a certain extent of the whole of the Red Sea, and is, in fact, the most important objection to the whole scheme of communication, it will be necessary for understanding the subject to explain the circumstances of the case at some length.

From such historical data as we possess, there can be little doubt that a water communication was opened between Suez and the Nile during the existence of the 18th dynasty, probably about 14 or 15 centuries B. C. It apparently was found to be of little use, for it was allowed to go to decay and fill up. Some seven centuries afterwards, when the communication between Assyria and Egypt was frequent and intimate, Pharaoh Necho tried to reestablish the canal; whether he succeeded or not is not quite clear, but it certainly was open and commonly used during the reign of Darius. But a second time it fell into desuetude, till it was again opened under the Ptolemies*, and apparently improved and widened under the Romans, to whom it was known as the Trajanus Amnis. But a third time it fell into decay, and was nearly obliterated when Egypt was conquered by the Arabs. Immediately they obtained possession of the country, Amrou saw the advantage it would be of in enabling him to supply the holy cities of Mecca and Medinah with the grain of Egypt; and for this purpose it was not only opened, but kept in constant use for 125 years, until political troubles interrupted the trade.

The first thing that strikes any one in reading this narrative is, that a canal that could so easily be opened, as this one was by every new dynasty, could still more easily have been kept open had it been found to be of any use. During the whole

* The canal completed by Ptolemy Philadelphus started from the Pelusiac or Eastern branch of the Nile, near Bubastes, and fell into the Red Sea near Arsinoe, which is nearly the course of M. de Lesseps' line. Strabo states it to have been fifty yards wide, and a thousand stadia in length.

* period, from Rhameses to Trajan, Egypt was not only rich and powerful, but was the great commercial emporium between the East and the West, and would undoubtedly have preserved this canal in a state of efficiency had not the difficulty of approaching Suez been so great, that it could not be used for commercial purposes.

This is still more evident when we attempt to trace the course of commerce in the Red Sea. The first great port there was Myos Hormos, at the entrance of the Gulph of Suez, where cargoes were discharged and carried overland to the Nile, a distance of 80 miles, at a time when the canal apparently was open. The next step was to carry the port still further down the sea to Kosseir, opposite Koptos on the Nile. But the capital improvement was when Ptolemy Philadelphus established Berenice, 170 miles nearer the Straits of Bab el Mandeb. During the whole of the subsequent period of the Greek and Roman occupation this was the great emporium of the trade, and it was found more convenient to carry the goods across the desert 260 miles, from Berenice to Koptos, rather than take them 170 miles further up the Red Sea, where the land carriage would have been reduced to 84 miles; and either of these courses was thought better than attempting to reach Suez, though, as the canal was then open*, an Indian vessel availing herself of it might have reached Alexandria or Ostia without breaking bulk. But, what is more extraordinary, during this period Axum became a great emporium of trade, and vessels discharged their cargoes in the harbour of Massowah, and sent them 1300 miles across the desert on the backs of camels, in preference to braving the dangers and difficulties of the Red Sea route.

Even as late as the time of St. Jerome, when long familiarity ought to have reduced the difficulties of this navigation to their true value, that holy father describes the Red Sea as so full of rocks and dangers, and the passage as so tedious, that, after being six months at sea, mariners considered themselves fortu-

* Strabo, in describing the route of six or seven days' journey first traced by Ptolemy II. from Berenice to the Nile, for the transport of merchandise by camels, expressly says, *Τοῦτο δὲ πράξει διὰ τὸ τὴν Ἐρυθρὰν ὑσπλουν εἶναι καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ μυχοῦ πλοῖζομένοις· ἐφάνη δὲ τῇ πείρᾳ πολὺ τὸ χρήσιμον* for he adds, that all the merchandise of the East was carried by this road, although the canal must at that time have been open. But Strabo confounded the position of Berenice with that of Kosseir: it was, in fact, 170 miles further south.

nate if they had traversed its full length, and reached a port of safety at the end of it.*

It will be suggested, no doubt, that the ancients were timid sailors, and their vessels unsuited for the navigation of the sea. Neither of these objections appears founded on fact. A thousand years' experience would surely cure any timidity that might exist; besides which a narrow sea, with high headlands on both sides, is of all others the most suited for sailors unfamiliar with astronomical observations, and before the invention of the compass. Small vessels, capable of using sweeps and running inside the reefs, are more suited to Red Sea navigation than the larger ships we now employ; and the reproach is hardly applicable to navigators who crossed the ocean so boldly from Babel Mandeb to Baragaza.

It is necessary to bear in mind that the Red Sea is 1500 miles in length, straight and narrow in its middle channel, and so deep that there is hardly any place where a vessel can anchor. This channel is bounded on both sides by coral reefs, so steep that a vessel's stern post may be grinding against the rocks under her lee, whilst she has 100 or 200 fathoms of water under her bow.

The winds in the southern part of the sea, from the entrance as far north as Massowah, blow with tolerable steadiness from north to south during the six summer months, and from the southward, in like manner, during the winter, so that there is no difficulty so far. From Massowah to Berenice, or Jiddah, they blow from the northwards during the summer months, and as much one way as the other, during the winter. To the northward of this, as far as Suez, they are described as blowing from the northward during ten months of the year, while during the remaining two they do not blow at all. The currents generally run with the wind at the rate of 1 mile or $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles per hour; but when a long prevalence of wind in one direction has heaped up the water either way, as soon as it falls calm, the current turns in an opposite direction, and frequently runs across the sea. From this description it will be easily understood with what difficulties a large sailing vessel has to contend. During the northerly monsoon she can only beat steadily to windward. If it blows fresh there is no port she can run to, no spot where she can anchor, and she must either run back, and loose probably the work of days or weeks, or struggle on till a shift of wind gets her out of her difficulties. If it falls calm she never knows which way the current is going

* S. Hier. Epist., lib. ii. ; Epist. 13. ad Rusticum.

to set, and if there is a reef to leeward nothing can save her from going on shore. The smaller vessels of the ancients and the Arabs avoided most of these difficulties: they ran through the openings in the reefs into the still and shallow water behind, where they always anchor in safety; and, taking advantage not only of the monsoons but of the airs off the land, they could creep along in safety, while the larger vessel outside is drifting to her destruction.

The officers of the East Indian navy who were employed to survey this sea, and who compiled the sailing directions that accompany their charts, are not so explicit on this subject as might be wished for our present purpose; their business was to point out dangers in detail, and the means of avoiding them, not to reason on the general facilities and difficulties of Red Sea navigation; and the consequence is, that though the list in detail is enough to make the boldest mariner hold his breath, it is not easy to abstract a general description of the whole; but one or two circumstances are incidentally mentioned which may serve to illustrate the subject. During the month of July, 1832, the 'Euphrates' worked up the sea from Mocha to Suez in 36 days, and again in 1836 performed the same feat in 32; but there is not probably one merchant vessel in a hundred that could do the same thing in twice that number of days, if indeed she could do it at all. This vessel was a clever man-of-war brig, with a crew capable of being divided in two watches, and each watch equal to working the vessel; but no merchant vessel carries a crew sufficient to work the ship without every hand being turned up; and a beating passage of that extent would probably destroy the whole of them in a climate where the thermometer during calm weather stands frequently at 92° before sunrise, and in a sea the entrance to which the Arabs, in their figurative but expressive language, call the Gate of Tears, and the headland near it the Cape of the Wind's Death. A vessel must be sharp and handy indeed, and her officers first-rate navigators, to make such a passage with anything like safety or certainty. 'If a vessel sails fairly,' adds Captain Rogers, 'she may average 35 miles per day, in sailing from Mocha to Suez in these [the 'summer'] months.' But as during any season of the year such a vessel would average 130 or 150 miles per day on a voyage round the Cape, without fatigue to her crew or damage to the vessel, this circumstance alone lengthens the Red Sea for commercial purposes to four times its geographical extent, or from 1500 to 6000 miles. We have no estimate of the time it usually takes, to perform the same passage during the winter months; but there is no doubt that the climate is more healthy

then, and the voyage can be performed with less fatigue to the crew, as it depends wholly on the light airs that spring up between the calms; as these, however, are very uncertain, so must the duration of the voyage be.

Since these surveys were made considerable experience has been gained in Red Sea navigation, in consequence of its being necessary to send coals to Suez for the use of the steamers there. As this has now been done every year for the last fifteen or sixteen years, the commanders of these vessels know perfectly what to expect, and what they can do. And as the price of coals there is one of the heaviest expenses the steam companies have to bear, we may feel perfectly assured that all conceivable means have been taken to reduce the rate of freight on them. The result will be apparent from examining any of the freight lists published in London; but adhering to the quotations published weekly in the 'Economist,' we find that the freight of coals from England to Aden in the winter months averages from 28s. to 30s., while from this country to Suez, it is 55s. to 60s., the difference being 26s. to 30s., which represents the freight between Aden and Suez. From the same authority we learn that when contracts are made at Newcastle for the delivery of coals, including all charges at these two ports, that the average price per keel of 21½ tons is 32*l.* to 35*l.* at Aden, and 65*l.* to 75*l.* at Suez, or nearly double; whence it is conclusively demonstrated that the cost and risk of a voyage from Aden to Suez is equal to the whole outward voyage by the Cape from England to Aden; for on the average of twelvemonths the rate of freight is as high between Aden and Suez, 1400 miles, as between England and Aden, which is 12,000 miles. This shows not only how absurd it is in closet navigators to calculate freights by lineal distance measured on the map; but also in what estimation the facilities of the Red Sea are held by our merchants.*

The insurance tells the same tale; the rate at Lloyds at present on a cargo of coals being 6 per cent. to Aden, and 8 or 10 per cent. to Suez; the rate is high from the danger of ignition, which is more likely to occur in the first part of the voyage, and this prevents the difference being so apparent as in the freight; but it is a fact that no Indian office will take a risk

* It may be suggested that this great difference is partly owing to there being no return freight from Suez; but neither is there from Aden; and a vessel can on the average of all seasons put herself in the same position to seek a freight in eight or ten days that is possessed by a vessel at Aden. This small difference can, therefore, be of no moment.

on an ordinary cargo to Suez, at a rate less than double of what it would charge on the same cargo to Aden.

The result is, therefore, that a vessel lying in the harbour of Aden would take a cargo on board for England, *viâ* the Cape, for the same rate of freight that she would charge for the same cargo to Suez. If the Canal were open, and the vessel had to pay 8s. or 10s. dues, if she had to incur a delay there of five or six days at least, in passing the Canal, and had then to encounter the uncertainties of the navigation of the Mediterranean, and the difficulty of getting out through the Gut of Gibraltar; it may safely be asserted that a vessel in Aden harbour would rather take 3*l.* per ton for England, if allowed to go *viâ* the Cape, than she would take 5*l.* per ton if forced to go through the Canal; and the merchant would save half the insurance *viâ* the Cape which he would have to pay *viâ* Suez. If this is true of Aden, it is of course doubly true of every other port in India; and until it can be shown that the reasoning by which these conclusions are arrived at is untenable, the Suez Canal must be considered as utterly useless, in so far at least as sailing vessels are concerned.

The same circumstances which render the Red Sea so unsuited to navigation by sailing vessels, are nearly all in favour of its use by steamers. The straightness of the middle channel, its depth and freedom from shoals, are all that can be desired. Its narrowness prevents there ever being a serious swell in it; and the light airs that prevail during nine-tenths of the year are most favourable, while a vessel going ten knots an hour may safely despise a current of one knot in whatever direction it may be flowing. The consequence is, that nearly all the passenger and parcel traffic now prefers this route to that of the Cape. But it is very questionable whether steamers will ever be able to compete with sailing vessels for goods' traffic. Every experiment to effect this on a large scale has hitherto failed, and according to present appearances, at least nine-tenths of the cargoes of the world will continue for a long time to be carried by sailing vessels.

It only, therefore, remains to inquire how far the Canal, if executed, would be useful for the steam traffic, and whether the railroad which is projected, and will be completed in the course of the next two years, will not suffice for the purpose, and in reality will do the work more efficiently.

At present we have only a bimonthly communication with India, but the increasing importance of the mails and passenger traffic will very soon require this to be increased to once a week, and the mode of working it will probably be something like the

following. Let us suppose an Indian steamer, A, to arrive any morning at Suez; she telegraphs her arrival to Alexandria, where a vessel, B, immediately gets up her steam and prepares for sea; within 10 or 12 hours from their arrival at Suez, the passengers, mails, and parcels are on board the vessel at Alexandria, and steaming out of the harbour. The next day the disembarkation of the cargo commences; and as steamers of 3000 or 4000 tons burthen scarcely carry more than 500 or 600 tons of cargo, even at the rate of 100 tons per day all this can easily be transferred to Alexandria in five or six days, and put on board a vessel, C, which then waits the arrival of the next steamer, D, from India. By this means the passengers and mails save nearly a week compared with the time it would take the vessel to coal and get through the Canal, and the goods do not lose a single day. Besides that it costs less, even at 1*l.* per ton per mile than it would cost if the vessel came through the Canal, and paid 8*s.* or 10*s.* dues on her whole tonnage.

A steamer once a week could thus easily convey 25,000 tons of goods either way in the course of the year, which is an amount of tonnage amply sufficient to cover all the silk and silk-piece goods, and as much of the indigo and other valuable articles as could afford to pay a high rate of freight. Indeed, so far as we can at present see, this is more than sufficient for all the requirements of the trade.

If M. de Lesseps' canal were open, a vessel might get through in three days, and allowing one day for coaling, and one to sail from Pelusium to the meridian of Alexandria, the saving on goods would, even then, be only 1 or 2 days as compared with the traffic by the railway, and the loss to passengers and mails 4 or 5 by the steamers making use of the Canal.

But, not to multiply objections, there is only one more that need be mentioned here, which is, that though the canals are designed on so gigantic a scale, they are still far below the requirements of the age. If the British Admiralty had thought proper to grant a share of the eastern traffic to the Eastern Steam Navigation Company, the Peninsular and Oriental Company were preparing to build four vessels of the dimensions of the *Himalaya*, to meet the competition. The other company must have met them with vessels at least as large, so that not one of the vessels employed on either side of the Isthmus could have got through the Canal. The '*Himalaya*' is 372 feet long; the '*Persia*,' the last vessel built for Cunard's line, is 390 feet in length; and even such vessels as the '*Great Britain*' and '*Royal Charter*,' which are respectively 332 and 336 feet in length, would be excluded; and a sailing vessel like the '*Great Re-*

public, 325 feet in length, could hardly have ventured into a lock only 330 feet in length. But this is only the beginning of things; for no modern discovery in ship-building is so certain as that a vessel's speed is almost in the direct ratio to her length. Thus, if a vessel 200 feet long will go 10 or 12 miles an hour, one 300 feet long will, *ceteris paribus*, make 15; one 400 probably 17 or 18, and 500 should reach 20 miles. It is expected that the great leviathan now building by Scott, Russell, and Co. at Millwall, will reach 23 or 25 knots an hour, her length being 680 feet, and her breadth 80 feet. Indeed, if the principles on which she is constructed be correct, there is an end not only of the canals, but the Red Sea may again be restored to its pristine solitude, undisturbed even by the weekly visit of the passing steamers. If the builders of this great vessel are not mistaken in all their calculations, she ought to make the passage from Galle to Southampton in 30 days; whereas a steamer 300 feet long, if passing through the Canal, would hardly do the distance in 40 days; and even with the advantage of the railway and a boat on either side of the Isthmus, would hardly be able to land her passengers and goods under 35 days from the time of starting. As the conveying power of vessels increases in even a much higher ratio than their speed from an increase of size, it is highly probable that we shall presently see a class of vessels built surpassing in size anything ever dreamed of. The projectors of the Canal must, therefore, either increase the length of the locks to 400 or 500 feet, and their depth of water to 30 or 35, or they would be obliged to refuse the only traffic that is ever likely to be offered to them.

With these facts before us, it seems almost a work of supererogation to argue to any great extent either the probable commercial or political results of the undertaking. These data will no doubt be thoroughly investigated before English shareholders, at least, will embark their money in it; and as they will inevitably find that the route round the Cape is infinitely preferable for commercial purposes, we may rest assured that the Canal will never be executed; or, if it were opened, it would, as in ancient times, soon be closed again, as it could never pay its working expenses. Still, as the commercial view is the one in which the engineers who are now being consulted are, probably, less competent to give an opinion than on the engineering question, it is necessary to say a few words regarding it.

In M. de Lesseps' pamphlet we have the following startling account of the commerce of the East and of its prospects. After an elaborate attempt to prove that Messrs. Macculloch and

Anderson, who had both written on the subject, were entirely wrong, the writers proceed to say:—

‘We are therefore quite sure of being below the reality in fixing the amount of commerce with places to the east of Egypt, in 1851, at 100,000,000*l.* (4,000,000 of tons) instead of 26,000,000*l.* (1,083,333 of tons) in 1841. At the time we write, the figures of 100,000,000*l.* sterling is perhaps quadrupled and carried to 10,000,000,000 francs (16,000,000 tons), and when the Canal is opened, this latter sum will be a mere mistake. In fact, not only the greatest part of the commerce of Europe with the extreme East will be carried on through the Maritime Canal, but moreover *all the activity in operation between America and China*, will abandon the route of Cape Horn for that of the Isthmus, which will be easier, shorter, and more certain. We may, therefore, be sure that the cutting through of the Isthmus will *increase tenfold the operations of commerce and navigation*; that, as with every undertaking based upon a true principle, the consequences **cannot** be calculated, and that the idea most exaggerated in appearance will always be surpassed by the reality. As, however, we are addressing ourselves to the commercial world, and have to convince all minds, even the most timid, it is necessary that we should fix on a figure, and that the figure should not startle any one. We have adopted 4 milliards (4,000,000,000) of francs, answering to 6,000,000 ton, which, according to what we have been showing, is, without doubt, already exceeded at present, or certainly will be, before the close of the undertaking. We have likewise assumed that of 6,000,000 tons, 3,000,000 will take the route of the Canal.’

The soberer statistics given by M. Baude, and the table by M. Chemin Dupontès, quoted by M. Talabot in the two papers on the subject in the ‘Revue des deux Mondes,’ enable us to check these preposterous speculations to a considerable extent. The following are their figures:—

		M. Baude.	M. Dupontès.
		Tons.	Tons.
Great Britain, 1853	- -	1,330,655	1,401,234
Holland, 1852	- -	286,151	335,909
France, 1853	- -	139,792	65,658
Spain, 1850	- -	11,517	8,062
Hamburg, Bremen	- -	-	19,699
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		1,768,598	1,830,562
Other countries of Europe approximately	-	-	169,438
			<hr/>
			2,000,000

The tables presented to Parliament, and those published by the East India and China Association, fully bear out these figures. From the latter it appears that the whole shipping

British and foreign, employed between Great Britain and places to the eastward of the Cape, was —

				Tons.
In 1853	.	-	Inwards	- - 555,192
			Outwards	- - 803,585
				<hr/> 1,358,777
In 1854	-	-	Inwards	- - 626,541
			Outwards	- - 812,182
				<hr/> 1,438,723

and the returns published up to September in the present year show no great elasticity in this respect. As might be expected, the great increase of British shipping of late years has been to Australia. In 1844 it was 77,816 tons, in 1854 it employed 597,632 tons. No other nation having a like stimulant, there is no reason to suppose that their trade has increased in anything like the same ratio as ours. But not one ton of the Australian shipping would ever come by way of the Canal, for the obvious reason that the usual passage to Australia, by the class of vessels now employed and building for that trade, is from 65 to 75 days, and the average passage from Alexandria to England is 65, and from England to Alexandria 47; so that, allowing a week for getting through the Canal, a vessel would make the passage to Melbourne in almost the same average time it would take her to get to or from Suez, leaving out altogether the Red Sea passage and the long voyage from Melbourne to Aden.

But assuming the Canal route to be all that its advocates expect, as far as India and China are concerned, it is not difficult to estimate the amount of advantage it would be of to those countries. If we divide the declared value of the goods shipped to us from India by the amount of tonnage employed to carry them, we shall find the average value of a ton to be something between 30*l.* and 40*l.*, and as vessels are always to be had at from 5*l.* and 6*l.* for the voyage out and home, freight to India, allowing for the smaller amount sent out, may be considered as a charge of 10 per cent on commerce.* The utmost that

* It is true, indigo, silk, and silk-piece goods, sometimes pay 5*l.* and even 6*l.* per ton, but their value is so great—from 400*l.* to 1000*l.* per ton—that the merchant willingly pays a high freight to secure the best ship, and the best place in that ship. On the other hand, oil, seeds, and coarse grain, cannot be shipped profitably unless freights are as low as 40*s.* or 50*s.*, and they are sometimes even lower. The medium articles, such as sugar, saltpetre, cotton, &c., are of the value above stated, and 3*l.* to 4*l.* is about the average rate of freight. If we throw China into the scale it will reduce the average considerably,

the most sanguine advocates of the Canal propose, is to reduce this by one half. The distance on the map, they say, is only one-half, and therefore the voyage will be reduced to that extent. Even ignoring all that has been said above regarding the difficulties of Red Sea navigation, there are two fallacies in this assumption. A commercial voyage does not consist only of the time a vessel is at sea. She must be lucky indeed, in an Indian port, if she is ready to sail within a month or six weeks from the time she is ready to take in cargo; and she must use very great dispatch, even in a European port, if she is ready to take in cargo again within a fortnight of her arrival; adding, therefore, this quantity to the two voyages, that by the Red Sea would be from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 months, that by the Cape from $5\frac{1}{2}$ to 6, and the saving, as far as the shipowner is concerned, only about one-third, or 3 per cent. instead of 5. A second fallacy is contained in the admission that there is only one season of the year suited for the voyage to India *via* the Red Sea, and one for the passage back, so that a vessel using this route could only make one complete voyage out and home in the year, and as a ship's expenses in harbour are nearly as heavy as when at sea, the owner would be almost as well pleased that she should be at sea four months as two months; at all events, the reduction in the account would be very small indeed.

There is still another view of the commercial question which is, perhaps, even more conclusive against the Canal; but from the nature of the case it is difficult to state it with the requisite precision. If the Canal were open and perfectly successful — if there were no difficulties in the navigation of the Red Sea, and the whole transit were as easy and as safe as the route across the Atlantic — the effect of the Canal would be to bring the East Indies as near to Europe as the West Indies. Geographically, the distance would be about the same; and commercially, the freight would be reduced to about the same rate. The question, therefore, is to ascertain what the difference of freight now is so that we may arrive at the benefit commerce is likely to derive from the Canal. From a careful examination of such data as are available, it is certainly overstating the case against the argument to say that if 4*l.* 10*s.* is a fair average out and home from the West, 5*l.* 10*s.* is the average to and from the East, in round numbers, say

as, owing to the greater value of the teas and silks, which are almost the only articles shipped from that country, freight is not more than 5 per cent. of their value.

an excess of 20 per cent.* As was shown above, freight is a charge of about 10 per cent. on the average value of goods, and one-fifth of this, the difference of freight between the East and the West, or 2 per cent. on the goods, is all that the Canal has to work upon for the benefit of commerce; but as its projectors propose to charge dues equal to 8s. or 10s. a ton, the only benefit to commerce that can accrue from the opening of the Canal is a reduction on the general prices of eastern produce to the extent of about 1 per cent.; and as it is expected that this will be realised on only one-half of the trade of the East, such a saving is so infinitesimally small that people may well be excused being apathetic regarding it.

The difficulty arising from the difference of the length of time occupied in the two voyages has already been practically obviated by the establishment of a quick postal communication between the two countries. From the moment it is known that a cargo is shipped, it is taken into account as if in stock in the country to which it is despatched, and as there is always a stock of all important articles equal to about a year's consumption, and never less than six months, the public care little where the supply is: all they want to know is that a certain quantity shall be forthcoming in a certain time; if assured of this, it is of very slight importance to them whether it be afloat or on shore. The merchant is equally indifferent; for as soon as the bill of lading and samples of a cargo arrive by the overland mail in Europe, he can raise money upon it, or buy and sell or deal with it exactly as if it were under his own lock and key. If the market is brisk, as much business is done on cargoes afloat as in goods on shore. If the market

* The freight of cotton from New Orleans varies from $\frac{1}{2}d.$ to $1d.$ per lb. and 5 per cent.; taking five-eighths of a penny as the average, this gives a ship about $3l. 3s.$ to $3l. 10s.$ Sugar from the Havanna averages about 60s. per ton, and coffee from Rio de Janeiro about the same. The outward freights to these places vary from 20s. to 30s. for the whole voyage; it is therefore about $4l.$ or $5l.$, or we may say $4l. 10s.$

On the other hand, Bombay cotton pays, on an average, about the same rate of freight as New Orleans. Sugar from Bengal may be taken at 80s. to 90s., but the harbour duties of Calcutta are nearly 20s. per ton. On the other hand, nearly 100,000 tons of rice are shipped annually from Aracan at rates averaging about $3l. 10s.$ to $3l. 15s.$, and as there are no imports into the province the whole expense falls on the outward cargoes. Freights from Canton are generally lower than those from Calcutta, owing to the nature of the cargo and the more moderate port dues. The outward freights may be taken at about the same rate as those to the west.

is dull, the merchant would rather the good ship stayed out a week or two longer. As soon as she arrives landing and other expenses are incurred; warehouse rent, fire insurance, and other charges commence, and may run on till they consume a large portion of his profits. The freight being settled beforehand, none of these begin so long as the cargo is afloat. The fact is, that the only party benefited by a quick voyage is the shipowner, and as he has already been allowed to charge 1 or 2 per cent. for the difference of the length of voyage, he has no reason to complain. The question that remains is, whether or not the opening of the Canal will effect a saving of even this trifling amount, which, so far as it goes, would no doubt be a gain, though a very unimportant one to the consumer.

In the meantime is it worth while to inquire what effect the saving of 1, or even of 5, per cent. would have on the commerce of the world? Would it enable Indian cottons to compete with American, or Bengal sugars with those of the Havana? Would it induce the Indians to use more goods from Manchester, or the French to drink tea instead of coffee, or to change their fiscal laws as regards sugar or silk? As we know from various attempts made before Sir Robert Peel's time to increase consumption by small reductions of duty, the effect of taking off even 5 per cent. would be hardly perceptible, though it would of course to some degree be a benefit, and the trade from the Indies might increase to that extent. In other words, if 1,000,000 tons of shipping used the Canal, and saved 5 per cent. on the value of their cargoes, the trade might from this cause increase eventually to 1,050,000 tons; but that is all.

In the above calculations no account has been taken of the interest to be saved, for the simple reason that the interest on the value of a ton of goods valued at 40*l.* is for the two months supposed to be saved on the voyage something under 8*s.*; but as this is the amount of canal dues intended to be charged, there is evidently no saving on this account; and if the more valuable goods, such as indigo and silk, are conveyed by steam and rail, the average value of the ton being lowered the interest will not suffice to meet the change.

It seems needless to carry the argument any further, though it would be easy to do so if required, for the whole thing is based on a mistake and an oversight. Messrs. Baude, Talabot, de Lesseps, and the two Bèys, all argue as if they were living in the times of the Greeks and Romans, or in those of the Venetians. They look on the Indian Ocean as a 'Mare

' Clausum ; ' they lament over the wealth of the East that is lying useless because it has no outlet, and regret bitterly that the arts of the West cannot be carried to those unknown regions. M. de Lesseps speaks of ' Les rapports de la civilisation occidentale avec des populations de plus de 700 millions d'âmes parquées jusqu'ici dans leur isolement et leur barbarie.' They stand forward in the garb of philanthropy as the champions of civilisation, anxious to bring into communication nations that have now no means of intercourse with one another ; to use their own motto, '*Aperire gentibus terram ;*' and, by breaking down what they conceive to be the barrier between the East and the West, to spread wealth and good will to the remotest corners of the globe. They wholly ignore the fact that the route round the Cape is a very broad and safe road, that vessels of the most ordinary quality can make the passage with ease and certainty, and that less skill in navigation is required on the part of the commander than in almost any voyage of the same extent. Finding by their maps that the distance in miles through the Canal would be only half, they jump at once to the conclusion that prices will be reduced in an equal ratio, and commerce in consequence doubled or quadrupled. Whereas the fact is, as we have shown above, that freight is one of the smallest items in the cost of production of most Indian articles, and the very utmost the Canal could save to the trade is certainly under one-twentieth of the cost, or less than 5, and most probably not even 1, per cent.

Still admitting, for argument's sake, that there would be an economy in using the Canal instead of coming round the Cape, it is easy to see that England is the country that would benefit the most by it, for the very obvious reason that at least three-fourths of the whole trade of the East is carried on by her and for her benefit. The trade of Holland is a practical monopoly at both ends, and she would consequently be very indifferent to any small saving. Spain and Portugal are too insignificant to be taken into account. Glancing at the tables last quoted, it will be perceived that the eastern trade of France is less than one-tenth of that of England. If, therefore, we could save 5 per cent., or even 1 or 2 per cent. on 20,000,000*l.* or 30,000,000*l.*, it would be worth thinking about ; 1,000,000*l.* or even half a million sterling a year is a large sum, but one-tenth of that sum would hardly affect the trade of France. But it may be argued that France is nearer the mouth of the Canal than England ; practically this is not the case as regards the Atlantic ports, and Havre must always be the entrepôt of Rouen, Paris, Lille, and all the manufacturing industry of the

north of France. Marseilles can never be a great centre of manufactures, if from no other reason than from the want of coal in the south; but were the Canal to answer all the expectations of its projectors it might have this effect: Marseilles might, like London, become the centre of the luxury trade of the East, and supply Lyons with the indigo and dye-stuffs it requires. Havre must always remain the Liverpool of France, and the real effect would be, that Bordeaux would sink to the condition of Bristol. It requires some nicety of calculation to estimate the advantage this would give France over England; but, assuming the whole saving to be 5 per cent., the advantage to France if her whole commerce came through the Canal would be something under 1 per cent.; and as it would fall more on the luxury part of the trade than on the more strictly commercial part, it is an item so infinitesimally small as to defy commercial calculation; and if the saving is under 5 per cent., which it almost certainly would be, even this small quantity must be further subdivided.

The argument of international jealousy on this score is much the same as if the people of Manchester had hesitated in making a railroad to Liverpool, for fear it should benefit the people of Warrington or Newton to a greater extent than themselves, or if the men of Birmingham had held back because Wolverton or Leighton Buzzard were nearer the capital. The advantage that France would have over England is as nearly as may be what Warrington and Wolverton have over Manchester and Birmingham. Yet they do not find their trade affected by it. The truth of the matter being, that neither the power of producing articles in the East, nor that of consuming them at home, depends on such infinitesimal questions as these. The power of France, either to pay for certain products, or to use them, is a far different and more complicated question, and one which would barely be affected by a slight reduction of freight between her ports and the far East.

The same is true of Austria and the Italian States: till their commerce is immensely developed beyond what it is at present, it will be far cheaper for them to resort to London, or to some of the great emporia of the West, to purchase eastern wares in such quantities, and at such times, as they want them; just as it is more convenient for a householder to buy what he wants at his grocer's, rather than to go to Mincing Lane to buy a hogshead of sugar or a break of tea, though, no doubt, he might get them at a reduction of price. But even when these countries do come into the wholesale market, they would

probably find the route by the Cape as cheap, and far more convenient, than that by the Canal.

It still remains to say a few words regarding the political bearings of the question; though it is more difficult to grapple with this than with any other part of the argument, inasmuch as the reasoning for or against it has never been put into such a tangible shape as to enable plain mortals to understand it. If it be meant that the existence of the Canal would give importance to Egypt, either by increasing her wealth or her power, or by enabling her to hold the keys of the East, this could not be anything but a benefit to the rest of Europe. Anything that would raise Turkey in any part of her empire to the position of a self-supporting Power, capable of maintaining her own dignity, would be one of the most important advantages that could be obtained for Europe at the present moment. The same results would be obtained if it should disseminate commerce in the Levantine countries. If it afforded an outlet for the commercial enterprise of the Greeks, or served to rouse the Turks from their lethargy, the result would be an unmitigated good which all must wish for; but which, as hinted above, might be as well attained at a much less cost, and by a far smaller canal, than that proposed in the gigantic scheme we have been considering.

One of the forms that diplomatic fears on this subject seem to have taken is, that the execution of the Canal would immensely increase French influence in Egypt. It has been proposed and advocated by Frenchmen. A Frenchman has obtained the concession; and it may be executed by French engineers and French workmen. All this might in some degree be true, if a body of French capitalists could be found who would of themselves subscribe the eight millions sterling needed, in the first instance, for the project, with the tolerable certainty of twice that sum being called for before it is completed.

The probability is, however, that it could not be undertaken without the assistance of English capital, and that would not be given unless English interests were fairly represented in the undertaking. But even if this were not the case, the French Company would very soon find out that they were wholly dependent on British commerce for their returns — three-fourths, if not nine-tenths of all the shipping that would pass through the Canal would belong to this country; and it is only by conciliating English interests that success could be hoped for. The only real ground for fear in this direction would be, if some French Government were at some future period to introduce into Egypt a body of French soldiers in the disguise of

navvies, and they were suddenly to throw aside their blouses, seize their arms, and take possession of the country. So ludicrous an enterprise is hardly to be anticipated. Whenever a European Power is prepared to seize Egypt, and has nothing to fear from her Christian competitors, she need not be deterred from fear of the native population, and may go boldly to work without recourse to concealment or stratagem. The fact is, that France will never again make the same mistake that was made by Buonaparte and the Directory, of invading Egypt without being perfect mistress of the sea, and assured of her communications with her base, and her means of supporting her army there; and if the French fleet is so triumphant as to enable her to do this, the route by the Cape will suit her as well as that by the Canal for the conquest of India if she should think fit to undertake it.

Even if the Canal were executed, it is far too delicate an instrument to be used for warlike purposes by any nation not in complete possession of the country. No ruler of Egypt would like to see a foreign fleet under the walls of Cairo; and either the pasha, or any hostile consul, might easily cause such damage to be done to the locks or works in the Canal as would leave the fleet high and dry in the middle of the country. Besides this the harbours either at Pelusium or Alexandria might easily be destroyed or blockaded so as to render them useless either for the succour or return of the fleet that had passed through. It seems needless to pursue this line of argument, for it is difficult to conceive any circumstances under which the Canal could be useful for warlike purposes. It is, in fact, a purely commercial question, and as such it is essentially an English and not a French or Continental question. If the object France has in view in urging forward the cutting of the Canal is to enable her to obtain Indian produce at a cheaper rate than other countries of Europe less favourably situated in a geographical point of view, she may attain this object far more readily by abrogating her protective system, which would at once lower the prices of Eastern produce to ten times the extent the Canal is ever likely to accomplish. In the meanwhile it seems not a little contradictory to put on protective duties to encourage *voyages de longs cours*; and, on the other hand, to attempt to shorten them by patronising the expensive and uncertain project we have been considering. To England the Isthmus question is of the most vital importance; one-half of her empire is situated, so to speak, at one end of the Canal and the other at the other end: every mile of distance and every hour of time that can be saved between these two extremities

is a positive benefit to the country. If the execution of the project were as easy as its projectors suppose, and its results in shortening the distance such as they anticipate, a British Minister would be perfectly justified in proposing to Parliament that it should be executed by the nation for the benefit of the world, and one-half the expense borne by this country, the other by the Indian revenues. At present the British Government pays annually from 200,000*l.* to 250,000*l.* to expedite this communication, and would willingly increase their contributions to almost any extent if a corresponding advantage could be gained, while France is not called upon to pay a shilling, and has really no direct interest in the question. The proposals for the Canal have not been entertained in this country simply because it is known that the difficulties of execution are far beyond the estimates, and that it would neither shorten the passage to India nor materially facilitate the intercourse between the mother country and its dependencies. At the same time the English people are intensely interested in the completion of the railroad through Egypt: they know that a line of steam communication between the East and Europe is almost indispensable in the present day for the accommodation of passengers and the conveyance of mails and light goods; and they feel that no exertions should be spared to make the line as perfect as possible.

It is apparent that this is not the view taken of the question in some influential quarters, inasmuch as a commission has been despatched to Egypt, consisting of MM. de Lesseps and Renaud and Lieussou on the part of France, Mr. M'Lean who is understood to represent Mr. Rendel for England, M. Negrelli for Austria, M. Lintz from Prussia, and M. Conrad from Holland. Such a body are, no doubt, perfectly qualified to point out the best line for the Canal, to decide whether M. de Lesseps' harbour or M. Talabot's aqueduct are practicable schemes, and also to estimate the cost of the undertaking within reasonable limits,—all this is only of secondary interest, and leaves the main question untouched. But, before asking for plans or estimates, prudent men must first consider what benefit would accrue to the trade of the country, and what returns would suffice to remunerate the shareholders. So, in this instance, what is first wanted is a commission of persons thoroughly acquainted with the commercial relations of the East, combined with others who are practically familiar with the facilities and difficulties of navigating the seas between Cape Gardafui and Gibraltar. When they decide that this route is easier and safer than that round the Cape, and, consequently, that when

the barrier of the Isthmus is removed, the greater portion of the Indian trade will come this way, it will then be time enough to ask the engineers to give their opinion as to the feasibility of the project. Till these previous questions are decided from different data than are now before us, and in a very different manner from what present experience justifies, the Suez Canal question may fairly be relegated among the *questions oiseuses* which may interest and amuse, but can hardly ever benefit mankind.

- ART. X.—1. *Geschichte der Feldzüge in der Asiatischen Türkei während der Jahre 1828 und 1829.* Von Obrist USCHAKOFF. Leipzig and Moscow: 1838.
2. *La Russie dans l'Asie Mineure.* Par FELIX FONTON. Paris: 1840.
3. *A Campaign with the Turks in Asia.* By CHARLES DUNCAN, Esq. London: 1855. 2 vols. 12mo.
4. *Kars and Erzeroum: with the Campaigns of Prince Paskiewitsch in the Years 1828 and 1829; and an Account of the Russian Conquests South of the Caucasus down to the Treaty of Turcoman Chie and Adrianople.* By Lieutenant-General MONTEITH, of the Madras Engineers, Nineteen Years attached to the Persian Embassy. London: 1856.
5. *The Transcaucasian Provinces the proper Field of Operation for a Christian Army.* By LAURENCE OLIPHANT, Esq. Second Edition, with a Preface written from the Seat of War. Edinburgh: 1855.

THE accomplishment of the principal objects of the Crimean expedition before Sebastopol has rendered it doubtful how much further military operations can be carried with advantage in the Tauric peninsula; whilst the gallant though unavailing defence of Kars by British science and Turkish heroism, and the recent movements of Omar Pasha in Mingrelia, have conspired to direct public attention to the countries between the Caspian and the Euxine. Asia Minor is the great reserve of Turkey in men and material resources, and the history of all her contests with Russia proves that the events occurring in Armenia and the Caucasus cannot be separate from those of the Danubian provinces. The Asiatic reverses of 1828 and 1829 were followed by the military and political capitulation of Adrianople; and again,

the terms of that disastrous settlement gave Russia an important accession of territory on her Armenian frontier, and a preponderating influence over the Eastern provinces of the Turkish monarchy and over Persia itself, although the Emperor Nicholas had formally disclaimed all territorial acquisitions in his declaration of war.

However incapable of self-defence the Ottoman empire may have become in its European provinces, the permanent interests of Germany and the Western Powers oppose a barrier to the direct encroachments of Russia on the Moldo-Wallachian Principalities, the stream of the Danube, and the Bulgarian fortresses. But on the rude and ill-defended frontier which separates the valleys and ridges of Georgia and Armenia from those of Anatolia, the balance of power has but a remote influence and an imperfect control. General Monteith's work furnishes us with a curious and instructive narrative of the aggressions of Russia upon her Asiatic neighbours from the first expedition of Peter the Great across the Caspian to the last campaigns of Prince Paskiewitsch, including the annexation of Georgia and the long series of hostilities on the Persian border. Before the commencement of the present war Russia had incorporated in her vast empire many of the most commanding positions in this territory. She had studded the Eastern coast of the Euxine with her forts; she had crossed the Caucasus with her military roads; she had established a monopoly of water communication and naval power on the Caspian; and the Pashaliks of Trebizond, Kars, and Erzeroum seemed to attract rather than to repel her progress to the heart of the empire. For it must not be forgotten that even in Asia Minor a large Christian population aspires for the day of deliverance from the Moslem yoke and for an equality of rights with the Mussulman subjects of the Porte. As early as 1779 the Christian princes of Imeretia, Mingrelia, Kartalinia, and Gurriel, provinces which once formed part of the ancient kingdom of Georgia, subsequently overrun by the Turks, invited the protection of the Empress Catharine, and welcomed the advance of a General Totleben of that day at the head of 40,000 Russian troops. Prince Paskiewitsch learned with surprise, in 1828, that nearly four millions of Asiatic Christians were watching the progress of the Russian armies. It is not impossible that even now one of the objects of Russia is to kindle an insurrection in these provinces; and in defending these important territories, the Porte can neither rely on the strength of its military positions nor on the fidelity of the population.

The works of General Uschakoff and M. Fonton, which we

have placed at the head of this article, supply us with abundant and authentic materials as to the military topography of these countries, and the strategical system which Prince Pas-kiewitsch devised with consummate ability for the conduct of the war in Asia in 1828-29. These are, in fact, the authorities which can alone guide us to a correct opinion on the hostilities again directed by the Russians against the same points of the Turkish frontier. The publications relating to the present war in Asia are incomplete and incorrect, and the enterprise of British journalism has not succeeded in supplying us with accurate information from the army of Anatolia. Indeed for many months past the communications with the headquarters of the army at Kars were so insecure that it has been difficult to transmit full official information. But it will be found that the narrative of the Russian campaign of 1828-29, compiled and published by men who played a considerable part in those operations, and who still figure in the staff of the Russian army and of Russian diplomacy, throws considerable light on the present state of affairs in Asia. General Mouravieff has adhered with extreme precision to the system of operations successfully pursued by his predecessor and master in the last war; the changes (if any) which have taken place must be sought in the improved condition of the Turkish forces, and in the superior skill and energy of their allies, which has, under the most discouraging circumstances, sustained their weakness and prolonged their resistance. We shall therefore follow General Uschakoff's narrative of the events of 1828.

On the Russian side, the strategical objects of the war were twofold: first, to create a diversion in favour of the army operating on the Danube; and secondly, by the possession of Kars and Akhaltsik, with Poti and Anapa on the Black Sea, to consolidate the possessions of Russia beyond the Caucasus, and to establish a more secure and enlarged basis for future operations against both Turkey and Persia. On the side of Turkey, Halyb Pasha, formerly ambassador at the court of Napoleon, was made Seraskier with the resources of eleven pashalics to draw upon, and the fighting general under him was Kiossa Mohammed Pasha, who had distinguished himself by his bravery in the wars with France and Russia and the revolts of the Servians and Greeks. Throughout the contest the Turks had a great superiority of numbers in the field. After leaving a sufficient number of troops to guard the Persian frontier and the Circassian provinces, the Russian forces disposable for active warfare in Asia Minor amounted to only

fifteen battalions of infantry, eight squadrons of regular cavalry, six pulks of Cossacks, and seventy-eight guns,—in all, about 12,000 men. For these troops three distinct lines of operation were open. That on the Russian right by the sea-coast might certainly have effected the capture of Batoum; but the deadly fevers of those Caucasian valleys threatened losses which the accomplishment of this object could not compensate. On the extreme left, the region of the Ararat was mountainous, inaccessible, and incapable of affording dépôts for the provisions and stores of the principal army. The central line based on Tiflis, with Gumri for an immediate starting point, and Kars, and ultimately Erzeroum, as points of attainment, was deemed in all respects the most eligible.

Within the Russian territory, Gumri, the frontier fortress, was the rendezvous of the army of Paskiewitsch, and it has since acquired, under the name of Alexandropol, far greater military importance than it then possessed, being now a first-class military station, within twenty-five miles of the ancient towers and modern tabias of Kars. Derbend and Baku were the ports of the Caspian through which the communications were maintained with Astráchan and the Volga, where Russia is even now straining every nerve to create more ample means of steam transport, and to provide against the possible contingency of the closing of the pass of Dariel. Tiflis was then as now the intermediate depôt, the arsenal and laboratory as well as the civil capital of the Transcaucasian regions, which we described after Baron Haxthausen in some detail in our last Number. ●

On the 12th of June, 1828, the concentration of all arms took place at Gumri, comprising 12,000 men and seventy guns, including twelve battering cannon. The usually large transport service of the Russian army amounted to nearly two thousand waggons, with about that number of pack-horses in addition. Like all prudent commanders, Prince Paskiewitsch had a constant eye to efficient transport, and maintained this difficult service less by requisitions than by wise and provident liberality to peasants and contractors. His marching order was also an improvement on former Russian methods. His baggage was always well secured in the heart of his army, and the advanced guard contracted so as to avoid the sudden attacks of large masses of Turkish cavalry, and supported by the bulk of his troops.

On the 14th the frontier was crossed, and while the brave but unready Kiossa Mohammed Pasha was still behind the Saganluk range, collecting provisions and men for the approaching campaign, Paskiewitsch marched boldly forward, and sat down before the fortress of Kars.

General Uschakoff's description of the military position of Kars has derived so great an interest from recent events, that we do not scruple to quote the passage.

'Already for some centuries before the birth of Christ, Kars was the capital of the Greater Armenia, and was renowned for the beauty of its climate and the wealth of its inhabitants. The Turks laid the foundations of the present fortress, which was built by Sultan Amurath III. in 1586, and was preferred to all the other fortifications of Asia.

'The place lies in a loop formed by the right bank of the Kars-Tchai; it is surrounded by double walls, and contains two citadels, one within the other, and some outworks. At the commencement of the war (of 1828), the principal suburb, called Orta Kapi, and another entrenched work on the shore of the river, were most strongly fortified. The fortress itself is very extensive, and includes the greater part of the dwellings. The north side, which lies on the edge of the cliff, is nearly 400 sagues long; the two other sides complete the form of an irregular polygon, whose whole circumference is about 695 sagues. The walls of the fortress and the citadel are built of very hard rough limestone, being in height from 2 to 4 sagues, and in thickness from 3 to 5 English feet. The citadel, called Naryn-caleh, stands on the summit of the hill, and is incontestably the strongest point both from its natural position, and the works which surround it. The lofty eminence of Kara Dag, which commands the fortress and the neighbouring country, was also fortified. Six hundred sagues from the north bastion, the Pasha of Kars had caused a four-cornered 14-gun battery to be erected on a steep promontory, which was connected with the ditches and glacis of the town by a curtain of wooden palisades. Other small detached works with rifle-pits were thrown out to protect the houses on the heights beyond the river; nearer these were regular lines to protect the riflemen. The old castle of Temir Pasha, which gives its name to one portion of the town, was the main point of defence of the works lying beyond the river. Flanked at the four corners by massive towers, this castle commanded not only the suburbs, but the south side of the fortress. Kars, the protectress of the fertile province of the same name, is likewise the bulwark of Erzeroum. The renowned Nadir Shah, who, on the 3rd June, 1735, annihilated a Turkish army of 100,000 men beneath its walls, in vain employed all his resources to reduce the fortress. On the heights before the town the lines are still to be seen which covered the Persian army of 90,000 men for four months, under the command of that prince known throughout the East for his victories. Many other attempts to reduce the fortress have failed in like manner, — amongst others the attack of the Russian army in 1806. The corps of Major-General Neswateff had already got possession of the suburbs of Kars, when it was compelled to raise the siege, after a short blockade. The forces at the disposal of this officer were not considerable, but the result of this

event was to confirm the Turks in their opinion that Kars was impregnable.' (*Uschakoff*, vol. i. p. 190-4.)*

The heights of Kitchik-kev gave Paskiewitsch a bird's-eye view of the basin of Kars, and he rejected the usual opinion that an attack on the Karadagh was likely to be successful. An attack from the south-western side, on the contrary, had the advantage of cutting off the connexion with Erzeroum, while his camp was near the running water. But in order to attain this object, it was requisite to defile along the plain of Kars, between the town and the hills, a difficult operation in the face of a numerous cavalry, which the Turks possessed. General Paskiewitsch, therefore, on the first attack ordered General Serghieff to cover his right, and then to make a feigned retreat. The Turks, elated with this apparent success, were hastily following it up, when General Mouravieff (the same officer who commanded in chief at the siege of Kars twenty-seven years later) suddenly broke in upon the left of the disordered pursuers, and secured the undisturbed completion of the movement to the destined position.

With the quick glance of military genius, Paskiewitsch had seen that the key of the southern suburb he was to attack was the high ground on the other side of the river, which had been entrenched by the Turks, but a height having been neglected, Paskiewitsch seized it in order to become master of this side, and then resolved to carry the entrenched camp. On the 23rd of June the Russians made the attack, and the first set was successful; but at the cemetery every inch of ground was contested, the Turks pointing their rifles from behind every gravestone, and the Russians advancing with the bayonet, until the fire of their adversaries compelled them to retreat. Strong supports, however, coming up, the Russians carried the

* We recommend to the inspection of our readers the plan of Kars and its environs on the scale of 700 feet to an inch which has just been prepared by Colonel Jervis, director of the military topographical and statistical department of the War Office. This plan is based on *Uschakoff's* survey, but includes all the new forts, lines, and batteries from the drawings of Colonels Williams and Lake. In military history and description, as well as in actual warfare, all is darkness without accurate maps and plans, and the public owes a debt of gratitude to Lord Panmure for having established this department of military topography, whose productions are accessible at a moderate price through the retail map-sellers. A rough but clear sketch map of the theatre of war in Asia is annexed to the second edition of Mr. Oliphant's pamphlet.

entrenched camp, and the Turks were driven across the river into the main town of Kars.

Paskiewitsch being thus at ease on his left, was enabled to erect batteries on the high ground overlooking the western front of the suburb, whilst the south was approached from the plain by the usual parallels. In a very short time, the houses being shelled and burned down, and a breach made practicable, the suburbs fell into the hands of the Russians. The inner town, full of confusion from the fugitives, had now its walls battered, both from the river and the suburb, so that the commander, Emin Pasha, was compelled to shut himself up in the citadel. In anxious expectation of the relieving army of Kiossa Mahommed Pasha on its way from Erzeroum, Emin professed a wish to capitulate, but asked two days for consideration; Paskiewitsch answered, that he gave him an hour to choose between surrender and grace, or resistance and putting to the sword. The troops learning this, compelled the Turkish commander to surrender at discretion, and on the morning of the 24th the Russian flag waved on the citadel that had resisted all the efforts of Nadir Shah. Thus after a three days' siege, Kars, with 129 cannon, 33 standards, and large stores, fell into the hands of the invader, with a loss of less than 500 Russians *hors de combat*. Such were the results of the judgment and promptitude of action shown by Paskiewitsch on that occasion. Kiossa had announced to the commander of Kars, that he would relieve him on the 23rd. He kept his word, but learned that the place had that day fallen, and was compelled to retrace his steps. To the astonishment and discouragement of the Turks, Paskiewitsch thus gained a firm footing within the Turkish frontier, at the very outset of the war. On those western heights which have recently been fortified by the science of Williams and Lake, and defended by the courage of Kmety, Paskiewitsch found the key of Asiatic Turkey, where General Mouravieff has been compelled to carry on for many months an arduous, exhausting siege, which left him no hope but the ultimate reduction of the place by famine.

Three roads now lay open to the Russian commander,—those of Erzeroum, Ardaghan, and Akhalkalaki. The first appeared too bold a venture, for in that direction was Kiossa Mahommed Pasha, who had reinforced his army by the remains of the garrison of Kars. Ardaghan was also too remote from the reserves, and the Russian army ran the risk of being cut off by a bold march of Kiossa. But Akhalkalaki was close to the Russian towns of Gumri and Tiflis, and if taken widened the basis of operations. Paskiewitsch, therefore, made a feint in the direction

of Erzeroum, which drove Kiossa Mahommed back to the lofty Saghanluk mountains separating the basin of Kars from that of Erzeroum, while the Russian army crossed undisturbed the Tchildir range towards Akhalkalaki.

In these Asiatic contests between the disciplined armies of Russia and the semi-barbarous forces of the Ottoman Empire, we are perpetually reminded that, although there is on the one hand an immense superiority of military science, and in the higher ranks of the Turkish armies an unparalleled amount of ignorance and corruption, yet amongst the Turkish soldiery traces of their ancient hardihood and spirit still survive, and only require to be led with ability to vindicate their independence in arms. Thus, when Paskiewitsch, after the fall of Kars, addressed a summons to surrender to the garrison of Akhalkalaki, they replied:

‘ We are not men of Kars and of Erivan, but of Akhalktsik.
 ‘ We have sent our wives, our children, and our property away.
 ‘ Never will we yield without a struggle. The proverb goes that
 ‘ one man of Kars is worth three of Erivan and one of Akhalkalaki worth two of Kars.’ (*Uschakoff*, vol. i. p. 230.)

The height on which Akhalkalaki stands is a promontory formed by the junction of the Ghendara and Taparawan rivers. The fortress was of quadrangular form, but overlooked by the hills on the other side of the water. To correct this defect half of the houses had been broken up to form an inner line of block-houses; but no attempt had been made to fortify the heights beyond the Ghendara. The Russian general found in them secure and convenient positions for attack on the very points which should have been converted into the outworks of the citadel. In a single night the batteries were complete, and in the morning the Turks saw themselves overlooked, and so closely that the Russians could hear the monotonous chant of the Koran, with which the faithful prepared their souls for the hour of battle. The fortress opened its fire with spirit, but produced little effect on the earthworks of the Russians. Far different was the Muscovite fire, which shivered the minaret into atoms, silenced the Turkish batteries, and drove the garrison first into the casemates, and then to the other side of the fortress; where seeing no hope of saving the place, and resolved not to treat or surrender, many began to let themselves down with ropes from the height. Six hundred perished in the assault that followed, and the moral effect of this blow was so great that the impregnable post of Hertwitz, some miles off, fortified with thirteen guns, surrendered without resistance.

The much more formidable undertaking of the capture of

Akhaltzik next presented itself to the Russian general, who had certain intelligence that Kiossa Mohammed Pasha was on the march thither from Ardaghan, with a relieving army. No time was therefore lost in the difficult mountain march thither: the pioneers ahead clearing obstructions, and bridging ravines; 200 men were sometimes employed to drag up a single gun, or whole fir trees cut down to insure the steep descent against fatal slips. Akhaltzik is situated on the northern bank of the Poskow river, a small tributary of the Kour, whose waters ultimately find their way to the Caspian. The town is divided into three parts by two ravines; the centre being inhabited by Moslems, and the two others by Armenians and Jews. The whole enceinte was palisaded. The central fortress had solid walls, and the citadel most massive towers. Being situated on the spurs of the range to the north of the river, two heights, the Kiahia Dagb to the west, and Taushan Tapa to the east, commanded the position to a considerable extent. The strength of the place was certainly not in the scientific character of its fortifications, but in the warlike character of its inhabitants. It was one of those half-robber, half-janissary nests, where the government of the Sultan was quite nominal; and to add to the difficulty arising from the usually obstinate defence of Turks behind walls, Kiossa Mahommed Pasha was encamped on the heights to the north of the town.

It was at two o'clock on the 5th of August that the Russian army, suffering from excessive heat, approached Akhaltzik; their columns halted, piled arms, and took a couple of hours' rest. Paskiewitsch having here perceived the hill of Taushan Tapa to be the key of the place, at four o'clock suddenly sent on his main body, supported by sixteen guns, and covered by Cossacks and rifles, which forced possession of the high ground to the east of the town. These heights he at once entrenched; for the siege of a place undertaken in the immediate presence of a relieving army, is one of the most difficult operations of warfare. Having protected himself from a *coup de main*, the next question was whether to prosecute the siege, or storm the entrenched camp of Kiossa. The latter proposition seemed the more feasible; and having called a council of war, he laid before it his plan for this object: which was to make a detour to the northward in the night-time—to storm by the back of the camp, so as not to have the guns of the fortress in the flank, and if possible to destroy the relieving army, and get possession of the high ground directly opposite Akhaltzik. This bold and ingenious plan was unanimously approved of by the council, and in order the better to deceive the Turks, the

siege batteries were proceeded with in the most ostensible manner.

The services of a Turkish traitor named Muta Bey were secured as guide for this delicate operation; and at two o'clock A. M., on the 9th of August, a force of nearly 7000 men and twenty-five guns set itself in motion on the circuitous route; but to keep a body of men together on a silent night-march is always difficult; and from delays in crossing the petty ravines, the sun rose when the Russians were still at some distance from the Turkish camp. To recede would have been ruinous, for even if successful in effecting a retreat in presence of the enemy, the plan of the Russians would have been revealed. Resolving to fight it out, Paskiewitsch caused the heights in his immediate neighbourhood to be crowned with the light troops and field pieces; and his main body, which still occupied a ravine hidden from the Turks, was ordered to climb a height immediately opposite the palisades of Akhaltsik. The Turks, now made fully aware of the formidable nature of the movement, attacked his left wing with all their force, in order to cut him off from the camp; but masters of defensible ground, the Russians stood firm, and with their artillery raked the Turkish camp until the intense heat suspended the fight. At two o'clock P. M. the renewal of the engagement commenced; partially at first, but with greater animation as the heat diminished. The camp leaning on the fortress formed the strength of the Turkish position. Paskiewitsch caused his cavalry to manoeuvre on his right. The Turks, afraid of being out-flanked, swallowed the bait, and moving their masses to the left, to counteract the apparent danger, weakened the centre. Paskiewitsch felt this to be the decisive moment; he attacked with all the troops he could muster, forced the entrenched camp, and drove the confused and routed Turks back into the palisaded enceinte, while the Russian cavalry on his extreme right, turning a demonstration into a real attack, made terrible havoc in the Turkish ranks. To rally was hopeless. Kiossa, wounded, sought refuge in the fortress, and so great was the panic, that Cossacks had only to show themselves in the other minor camps to produce immediate dispersion.

The Russian victory on the 9th of August thus accomplished the double object which Paskiewitsch had promised to himself — the destruction of the relieving army, and the occupation of the most favourable position for the erection of batteries for the reduction of Akhaltsik itself. From the 9th to the 15th of August the shot and shell told terribly on the place, and a breaching battery cleared away the palisades of the outer enceinte. On the afternoon of the latter day, the Russian troops

received their instructions to storm. The motive of Paskiewitsch for the choice of this hour was, that as similar assaults usually take place in the night, or at early dawn, the Turks were always prepared and manned the walls at that hour, whereas during the day they indulged in sleep so as to be on the alert after dark; at the same time, in the event of an unsuccessful assault, the fall of night would cover the Russian reserves.

At three o'clock the superior officers and the battery commandants went to the quarters of the Russian general to receive his last orders: within an hour the troops took their appointed places; Paskiewitsch stationed himself at the great battery on the northern height, so as to overlook all the operations from a commanding and central position. At four o'clock a brisk cannonade was opened from all the Russian batteries. Colonel Borodin flew to the breach, forced himself into the bastion with the Shirwan regiment, cut down the Turkish artillerymen and made himself master of three guns. This first success justified the plan of Paskiewitsch, for the Turks showed themselves quite unprepared; but no sooner were they awakened to the danger, than they poured in masses to the defence; the Russians gained the Catholic churchyard, but an advance of sixty yards had cost ten officers, and as they went forward into the town the defence became still more obstinate. Sabre in hand, the Turks rushed up to the Russian ranks, which were disordered in the onward movement, and even the women of the quarter fought undismayed by the side of their fathers, their husbands, and their sons. The reserves were sent on, and the palisades being laid flat by the pioneers, who lost many men in the operation, they formed a bridge over the ditch, across which light Russian artillery was taken with all speed, but every house was defended, and there were no wide streets or open places where lines could be properly deployed. At seven in the evening, after three hours' hard fighting, this terrible assault was still undecided; but several houses having been set on fire by grenades, which produced great confusion, the Russians profited by the accident, and the quarter on that side of the town it became literally too hot for the defenders. It was by the blaze of whole streets that the struggle now continued during the night, and when the morning sun gilded the clouds of smoke that rose from the ravines of Akhaltsik as from the crater of a volcano, groups of aged Armenians, with women and children, headed by the clergy with cross in hand, and mingled with unveiled Turkish women, streamed

in terror to the Russian lines. The garrison took refuge in the citadel, but Paskiewitsch, having no men to spare, agreed to a capitulation, by which they were allowed to march out with arms and baggage, the material of war remaining in the hands of the Russians.

Thus fell the haughty Akhaltsik, Paskiewitsch entering with his staff, while the Turks, with many tears at the sight of their roofless dwellings and forlorn families, slowly withdrew. Destruction was visible on all sides. The guns on the walls lay burst or dismounted amid balls of all calibres. The great well of the citadel, with a treble roof of solid beams, was shattered by a shell; and piles of dead bodies encumbered the streets. Of 400 artillerymen only fifty remained, and above 100 janissaries were killed or wounded to the last man.

Atshkur and Ardaghan were the immediate fruits of the fall of Akhaltsik; these places surrendered at once; and the whole centre of the Turkish line of country being broken through, the extreme right and left also fell. Bayazeed was occupied, thus cutting off the commercial connexion with Persia. Toprahkalah followed, on the 14th of September; and on the Russian right Guriel, overlooking the Black Sea, was effectually occupied by General Hesse.

Thus ended in 1828 the campaign of General Paskiewitsch who had accomplished all that he had planned; that is to say, he had got possession of a line of advanced posts, with a territory geographically complete within itself, and offering a formidable basis for future operations. With 12,000 men, of whom not above a fourth had fallen, he had, by a series of varied and rapid operations, conquered three pashalics, with six fortified places mounting 313 guns; 8000 prisoners, and 195 standards had also fallen into his hands. The balance-sheet was indeed a different one from that of the grand army of the Danube, which had been compelled to recross that stream, and had failed in the principal sieges undertaken by the Russian engineers in Europe in the same year.

The Russian commander passed the winter in Tiflis, revolving vast plans for the coming campaign. Being informed of the Emperor's intention to strengthen the Caucasian army with 20,000 men, he designed to make himself master of Erzeroum early in the spring, and there to await the intended reinforcements; and to stir up the Kurds against the Porte, an operation that has since been attempted with no inconsiderable success. Thence marching on Sivas and Tokat he meant to cut off the connexion between Constantinople and Bagdad, whilst the pasha of Mesopotamia

was to be incited to set the Porte at defiance — an attitude which, apart from all Russian instigation, the governors of this remote and isolated province are only too often disposed to assume. The treaty of Adrianople prevented the latter part of this plan from being executed, but it is not uninteresting to know what might have been attempted in Asia, had the Porte been compelled to deal single-handed with Russia after the Menschikoff mission. The actual invasion of India may be a chimera, not so the conversion of the satraps of Turkey and Persia into satellites of the Czar. It is not generally known that at the very outset of the present war, before the Western Powers had declared themselves as active belligerents, Prince Woronzow urged upon the cabinet of St. Petersburg the policy of an immediate march upon Erzeroum, for the purpose of accomplishing the grand scheme of operations framed but left unfinished by Prince Paskiewitsch in 1829. The Emperor Nicholas declined however, at that time, to act on this suggestion. The influence of Russia in Asia Minor has always been assisted by the venality and jealousies of the local Turkish authorities; in pursuance of this policy of division, the pasha of Mush was induced in 1828 to turn traitor. His country is chiefly inhabited by Kurds, and instead of furnishing 12,000 men to the Porte, which he was bound to do, he entered into a secret arrangement with Russia to hold back. Thus the Porte not only lost a valuable contingent, and had its line of defences broken, but this circumstance disengaged a great part of the Russian left wing. Nevertheless the Porte pushed forward its preparations in the most determined manner. With raw recruits and the reorganised remnant of the army, the Turkish forces in this part of Asia again amounted in 1829 to nearly 80,000 combatants, with sixty-six guns, under the command of Saleh Pasha Seraskier, in place of Halyb Pasha, dismissed in consequence of the failure of the previous campaign.

As Akhaltsik, although geographically contiguous to the Russian territory, was nevertheless garrisoned by few troops, and communicated with Georgia only by bad roads, Saleh Pasha formed the bold project of cutting it off in the middle of the winter, with the assistance of Ahmed Bey, prince of the Adjars, who had 30,000 fighting men in his territory, and was styled Pasha of Achaltzik. Prince Bebutoff, who commanded the place, had, on the intelligence of Ahmed Bey's irruption, withdrawn himself within the citadel, with 700 Christian families. Ahmed Bey attempted the assault by escalade, which, however did not succeed, notwithstanding the extraordinary bravery of the assailants, and the fortress was soon afterwards relieved

by a rapid and skilful march of General Burtzoff. Bebutoff issuing from the fortress attacked and dispersed the demoralised rear-guard of Ahmed Bey. The union of the relieving corps of Burtzoff with the Russian garrison terminated this operation, and compelled Ahmed Bey to make a precipitate retreat. Superior to the Russian soldier in physical strength and instinctive courage, the Turkish populations succumbed not only to the able general direction of the campaign by a master hand, but on their own side they suffered grievous defeats from the want of the most obvious elements of the art of war. Kars fell for want of timely relief; Akhaltsik, which might have been retaken, was effectually relieved by the superior activity of the Russians. Yet although the operations of the Transcaucasian army in 1854 and 1855 have shown little of the genius of a Paskiewitsch, many of the very same faults and shortcomings have been exhibited on the side of the Anatolian commanders.

The Turks having failed in the attempt to recapture Akhaltsik, were concentrated, to the number of 50,000 men, under the Seraskier at Hassan Kaleh, while their advanced guard was strongly posted on the Saghanluk, a range of mountains which intervenes between Kars and Erzeroum. Differences with Persia, into which it is not necessary to enter, detained Paskiewitsch in Tiflis until late in spring. The season was still cold and unfriendly in those elevated regions, the tops, even of the moderately high hills, were covered with snow, the spring grass came slowly out, while rain and hail rendered extremely difficult the march of the troops to Ardaghan, which was selected by Paskiewitsch as the immediate basis of his next operations. Fully informed by spies of the dislocation of the Turkish troops, the penetration of the Russian general enabled him to anticipate the designs of his antagonists.

After some successful preliminary operations, in which generals Mouravieff and Burtzoff distinguished themselves, the concentration of all the corps was accomplished at Kotanly, on the road from Kars to Erzeroum, on the 9th of June, and the army mustered 18,000 men with 70 guns. Two roads lead over the Saghanluk range and meet again on the other side, at a stone bridge over the Araxes at Korpikioy. The one to the left is by Milli-Duz, that to the right (proceeding from Kars in the direction of Erzeroum) goes by Kainly and Zevinn. On this latter road the Saghanluk chain is so high that snow lies on the ground until far on in the summer. Thick wood covers the slopes for many miles, and gullies intersecting the mountains in all directions facilitate defence. The Seraskier Saleh Pasha posted his resolute lieutenant, Haki Pasha, on the

Milli-Duz pass, in order to entice Paskiewitsch to engage himself in the intricacies of the mountain while he himself was moving on to occupy the Zevinn pass (on the Turkish left and Russian right), with a force of 30,000 men, in order to destroy or enclose the Russians.

Haki Pasha, with 20,000 men, 16 guns and a mortar, had entrenched his camp at Milli-Duz on a plateau commanding the pass; while on his left he kept up a communication with the other road by light troops, intending to take Paskiewitsch on his left flank should he attack the Seraskier at Zevinn, or to cause his coadjutor to advance on his right flank should he himself be attacked at Milli-Duz. With his front leaning on the abrupt banks of the Khani-Su, two other sides of his camp were bounded by steep rocky and woody slopes, while his position was accessible only on the south across a continuation of the naked plateau upon which his camp was posted. This strong natural position was strengthened moreover with earth batteries and trenches.

But the other pass of Zevinn was not yet crowned by the army of Saleh Pasha, who was advancing from Hassan Kaleb; and the observations of a Russian officer who had been sent to Erzeroum in 1827 having made Paskiewitsch acquainted with the localities, he became convinced that his object ought to be to separate the two armies of Haki and Saleh by anticipating the latter in his occupation of the Zevinn pass, so as to be able, if possible, to take the entrenched camp of Milli-Duz from the inner side with its accessible plateau.

In order to deceive the Turks as to his plans, Paskiewitsch moved ostensibly on the approach to Milli-Duz, which led Haki Pasha to prepare for a serious attack on his front, while the other road of Zevinn was neglected by the tardy Seraskier and the preoccupied Haki. Paskiewitsch then divided his army into two columns: one, composed of 3000 men under the orders of General Burtzoff, was to barricade itself at the bottom of the valley opposite the entrenched camp of Milli-Duz, so as to protect the baggage and provisions, and execute a false attack against the entrenched camp, while the other, amounting to 14,000 men and 50 guns under the orders of Paskiewitsch himself, was destined to march on the Zevinn road. In order to mask this movement Burtzoff deployed his troops on the brows of hills beyond the valley through which the main army defiled to the right. Thus the general in chief made all speed towards the pass of Zevinn while the Turks had their attention occupied with the

manceuvres of General Burtzoff, who at nightfall made a great display of fires as if all the army were there.

Favoured by the night, the plans of Paskiewitsch entirely succeeded. The Turks at Milli-Duz found all their outposts driven in by Cossacks and were occupied until daylight with the manoeuvres of Karpoff, the commander of Burtzoff's cavalry. At eight o'clock in the morning the Turkish fire suddenly ceased, and they withdrew themselves into their entrenched camp, astonished to receive the intelligence that the main body of the Russians could menace their left flank and was now within the Saghanluk. In the silence of the night Paskiewitsch, regardless of the fatiguing effort, had marched to the pass of Zevinn, and was thus *à cheval* on this lofty mountain range, while the Seraskier was still on the march from Hassan Kaleh.

Advancing to Kainly in the interval open between the two pashas he compelled them to remain divided, and, master of the interior line, could bear his masses against the Seraskier or against the fortified camp of Milli-Duz. We must refer the reader to Ushakoff for the details of the battle of Kainly, which, like some others, may be called a battle of 'shoe-soles.' The victory was organised with the pins on the map, and lay more in this bold and ingenious march than in the powder and shot expended. The rout of the Seraskier was complete. Twelve pieces of cannon were taken by the Russians, the Turkish army was destroyed or dispersed, all the baggage and provisions fell into Russian hands, and the Seraskier was only saved from capture by the fleetness of his horse.

Few of the ablest operations of war show combination more skilful, manipulation more ingenious, with a more prompt solution, than those we have here delineated. In two days Paskiewitsch passed the Saghanluk, dispersed the grand army of the Seraskier, and opened to himself the undisputed way to the attack of the fortified camp at Milli-Duz, from the inner and accessible plateau; thus offering that union of the large views of the strategist with the technical ability of the tactician which forms the perfect theoretical and practical commander. We have entered somewhat minutely into these details, because they describe with precision the movement General Mouravieff would be called upon to make should he hereafter attempt to advance from Kars on Erzeroum.

The camp of Milli-Duz, as we have seen, was unattackable from the Kars side, in consequence of the precipices with which it was bounded; but the possession of the interior line enabled Paskiewitsch entirely to cut off the communications of Haki Pasha, who in fact was in uncertainty as to the fate of the

Seraskier. The Russian commander learned this when he was in sight of the place, and having before his eyes preparations for a vigorous defence, one of his Turkish prisoners was allowed to escape, who of course related the destruction of the army of the Seraskier and destroyed the *morale* of the Turkish camp. The attack was opened by a vigorous fire of all the Russian artillery, which was at first replied to with some spirit, but at the storming of the entrenchments the efforts of the demoralised Turks, being directed rather to escape than to make good the position, the camp, artillery, and stores were all captured, Haki Pasha himself being made prisoner.

The result of this final disaster was the fall of Erzeroum, the arsenal of this part of Asia, without even the semblance of systematic resistance. The fanaticism and anarchy of the remains of the Turkish armies only precipitated the surrender of the place, and the capture of the Seraskier himself.

Here the decisive campaigns of the Russians in Asia Minor virtually terminated, and the operations sink into the desultory warfare of those who, like Goldsmith's curate, even when vanquished would argue still. These brave mountain populations persisted in ignoring their defeat as long as a burgh could mount a few rusty antiquated guns on a still more antiquated keep, or beset a defile with free rifles. Isolated *coups de main* against outlying parties of the army of Paskiewitsch were easy, but wherever he brought his central force to bear, resistance disappeared. No main Turkish army continued to keep the field; the difficulty he had to contend against was a too great extension and dispersion of his small force over a mountainous country, deficient in good roads and available resources. This state of things was terminated by the treaty of Adrianople, and the fairly earned baton of Field Marshal was placed in the hands of this eminent and successful commander. These details derive their chief interest at this moment from the analogy they present to the operations in which the same antagonists have been engaged on the same spot during the present war, to which we shall now proceed to turn our attention.

Actual hostilities were not commenced on the Russo-Turkish frontier in Asia until late in the autumn of 1853. According to all appearance the intention of the Emperor Nicholas was to remain on the defensive in Asia. The invasion of Turkey in Europe being an undertaking onerous enough in presence of the renovated military institutions of the Ottoman Empire, of which the flower was the grand army of the Danube under Omar Pasha, a commander such as the Turks never

had before, uniting audacity with caution, and the theories of Europe with a thorough practical knowledge of the capacity of Ottoman troops. But forty thousand Turkish troops were assembled at Erzeroum and its dependencies, while the disposable Russian force does not appear to have exceeded half that number; and no sooner had war been declared at Constantinople, than orders were sent to the Pashas on the Asiatic frontier to commence offensive hostilities. Sharp encounters took place between a portion of these forces in October and November. Schefketil, called by the Russians St. Nicholas, a fort within their territory between Batoum and Poti, was seized by the Turks and successfully retained. But in the interior the main army of the Turks was unsuccessful. Their pivot on the frontier was Kars; that of the Russians was Gumri. The army of Erzeroum had commenced its march on the 7th of August; two divisions of 15,000 men being directed on the Russian frontier, and 5000 men left in Kars as a reserve, while another column of one regiment of cavalry, eight battalions of infantry, and two batteries of twelve guns, advanced upon Ardaghan, to keep in check the Russians in the direction of their strong position of Akhiska. On the extreme right wing of the Turks, that is to say at Bayazeed, the *vis-à-vis* of Erivan, no movement of importance appears to have taken place.

The first success was on the side of the Turks, animated with that ardour and impetuosity which seems never to fail them at the outset of their wars. As they were advancing from Kars to Gumri, the Russian commander, General Prince Bebutoff, came out to meet them; an action ensued at Buindir, almost under the walls of Gumri, on the 3rd of November, the result of which was favourable to Abdi, the Turkish general. But, unfortunately, the Pasha, reposing on his laurels, returned to Kars; and as he neglected to effect a junction with the column that had been pushed on from Ardaghan to Akhiska, that detachment was defeated on the 14th of November, with the loss of its twelve guns, although the killed and wounded on the Turkish side did not exceed 200 men. The remains of the Ottoman army were collected under Ahmed Pasha, but attacked by Prince Bebutoff at Gedikler, on the 18th of November, and again so utterly defeated that twenty-five guns fell into the hands of the Russians, and this engagement was followed by the dispersion of the whole army.

The contrast between the army of Asia commanded by Abdi and Ahmed Pashas, and that of the Danube, which had so redounded to the honour of the Ottoman arms, caused the Porte to send an

extraordinary commissioner to inquire into the state of affairs. Haireddin Pacha found the Turkish troops at Kars, consisting of 20,000 bayonets, to be in a most deplorable condition, the generals plundering the military chests, while the troops were suffering from cold, hunger, and the ravages of typhus. Mr. Duncan had the good fortune to fall in with this personage, in the desolate regions extending from Batoum to the headquarters, and his narrative, though very superficial and incomplete, supplies us with some information as to the state of the Anatolian army at that time. The complicated hardships of the soldiery were borne with that patient resignation which forms one of the finest and most useful traits in the Oriental character. At all times the provisioning of Kars is difficult: but now the road from Erzeroum was blocked up with snow, and the Russians had taken the precaution before the commencement of hostilities to fill their granaries with the harvests of the Turkish corn fields. In the battle, which had decided the previous campaign, the Ottoman troops, before engaging, had disencumbered themselves of their great coats, which all fell into the hands of the Russians; firewood was scarce in Kars during the winter, the cold was intense, and all these difficulties were aggravated by the scandalous corruption of the superior officers, whom the imperial commissioner deposed and sent to Constantinople for trial.

Various Europeans were attached to the army of Kars, but none of them held regimental commands, because the bigotry of the Porte still refused at that time to entrust military command to Europeans, although its very existence depended on the intervention of the Christian powers. The strictest Mussulman might have seen with pleasure the employment of the skilled intelligence of Klapka, and the energetic soldierly qualities of Guyon, in defence of the legitimate cause of the Sultan; but a repugnance to confide a command to officers who had not made the profession of Islamism still prevailed even amongst those who are called the most liberal members of the Divan. Guyon and the Poles were at drawn daggers with each other, which was seen without displeasure by the Turkish officers of the old school, who bore Guyon a grudge for the sincerity of his language and conduct in denouncing and preventing their peculations. Thus the staff, although comprising several able individuals, and costing the Porte much money, was a failure.

To crown the whole, Zarif Mustapha Pasha, who succeeded to the command in chief on the deposition of the beaten generals, was not a soldier by profession. Thoroughly master of the Turkish arts of personal aggrandisement, but totally ig-

norant of the art of war, he had, however, the merit of getting the army much better victualled and administered — a most important matter after the privations of the previous winter. From the penury of the treasury, very little intelligence could be obtained of what the Russians were about, who, on the other hand, knew everything that was passing at Kars: even when correct information was obtained, the proceedings were mis-managed. The garrison of Akhalkalaki being small, it was open to a *coup de main*, but instead of sending off a flying column to surprise the place, a general was despatched to reconnoitre the ground, and the Russians being made aware of the circumstance, marched 8000 men to the spot, so that the expedition was no longer practicable. The Turkish commander even committed the extraordinary error of having little intelligence and no effective concert with the army of Batoum operating in Gurjel from the Black Sea, which was now completely occupied by the allied squadrons.

That the campaign of 1854 should prove disastrous after so inauspicious a beginning, is not to be wondered at. Gumri was, as in the time of Paskiewitsch, the bulwark of the Russian frontier on the side of Kars. A mountain rises abruptly from the banks of the Arpachai: the summit presents a plain, in which trenches have been dug, and walls of solid masonry constructed, with a casemated gallery connecting the whole place. Within, are barracks, hospitals and a church, the spire of which can be seen from the heights near Kars. Two minor forts, termed the black and red towers, enhance the strength of the fortress. The main Russian army under Prince Bebutoff at Gumri amounted to 15,000 men, whilst that opposed to the army of Batoum on the Euxine coast counted 12,000 men. The left wing at Erivan was composed of 3000 men under General Wrangel, an able and enterprising officer. This was the disposable army of the Caucasus, which has sometimes been set down on paper at 100,000 men. The forts under Abassia on the Black Sea had been judiciously abandoned, but a considerable force was still needed to watch Schamyl as well as to garrison Tiflis, the ports of the Caspian, and Vladi-kawkas, a fortress intended to command the new central mountain road across the Caucasian chain.

The climate of this region usually consists of a long snowy winter, deluges of rain in spring, and intense heat in summer; but in 1854 the rains were so late, that even up to the end of June, the plains were mere morasses from the quantity that had fallen. At length, on the 1st of July, General Prince Bebutoff, with 15,000 men, left Gumri, and having crossed the

river Arpa, took up a position on the Turkish territory at an hour's march from the Ottoman advanced guard posted in Soobattan and Hadji Velikoi. His centre rested on the villages of Ingedereh and Kurek-Dereh, and was partially screened by an isolated hill that rose in the plain in advance of these villages.

On this movement of the Russians a council of war was held at Kars, and it was determined to advance with the whole Turkish army to the frontier, and act according to circumstances. On the 3rd of July, the army marched out of Kars, and advanced in columns to Hadji Velikoi, within a few miles of the Russian encampment. In the course of the week the strength of the Turkish army had been increased by the corps of Kerim Pasha from Ardaghan, 4000 men being left behind as a reserve at Kars; the Russian army also received reinforcements. But during a whole month, neither party seemed inclined to risk a general engagement, and the feints on each side resembled those of Italian *condottieri* in bloodless ingenuity, with the exception of some smart and daring outpost work by the Bashi-bazouks under General Kmety.

General Kmety, on the 16th July, gave orders for the different chieftains of Bashi-bazouks to concentrate their followers on a given point. In the dead of night Kmety divided his force of 1500 horsemen into three columns; the command of one he entrusted to Hagi Denera, that of the second to Colonel Tevis, and the third column he led himself. At midnight the three bodies left the rendezvous, and by a rapid ride turned the extreme left flank of the Russians, and thus gained the rear of the enemy. Kmety had formed the daring plan of marching upon Gumri, and attempting to fire that fortress; but he had been overruled by the Muchir, who had with great reluctance given to the gallant Hungarian permission to undertake the present operation. Having penetrated to the rear of the enemy without detection, the columns of irregulars advanced in deep silence on the village of Baidir; which, situated within a short distance of Gumri, was of great tactical importance to the enemy. Baidir was defended by some slight redoubts, and was garrisoned by a body of Georgian militia and Cossacks.

The Bashi-bazouks arrived before the village at daybreak, and after a slight rest prepared for action. One column remained before the place to guard against surprise from the enemy's cavalry; a second column advanced against the village, whilst the third dashed at full gallop into the redoubts manned by the militia. The surprise was complete, and the Russian garrison, totally demoralised by the sudden nature of the attack, offered but a faint resistance. The Russian redoubts were captured off-hand, and the defenders cut down.

The alarm had now been raised in the village, and the whole garrison poured out to repulse the Bashi-bazouks, who, now wild with

excitement, proved irresistible. The Georgian militia and the Cossacks were totally defeated, and finally took refuge in the houses, which they barricaded. The Turkish irregulars could with difficulty be restrained by Kmety from firing the place, and thus destroying the Russians to a man. The scouts, who had been left to the rear by the general, announced that the whole camp of the enemy was in motion, and that the Russian dragoons were preparing to mount. No further time could be wasted, and it was necessary to evacuate Baidir before the enemy had intercepted all means of retreat. The Bashi-bazouks re-formed their columns, and collecting the spoils of the night, returned to their quarters, taking a contrary direction to the one by which they had advanced. The irregulars arrived in perfect safety in camp, and were received by the whole army with loud demonstrations of triumph and joy.' (*Duncan*, vol. ii. p. 156.)

Meanwhile an untoward event occurred at Bayazeed, which was defended by 5000 men under Selim Pacha, and opposed to General Wrangel, who commanded at Erivan. Selim had been ordered by no means to engage the enemy, and in case the Russians should seriously menace Bayazeed, to abandon that town, and retire on Kars. In the event of being surprised and defeated, he was ordered not to retire upon Van, because the road to Kars would be laid open to the pursuing enemy. On the 20th of July, General Wrangel (who had been reinforced by Prince Bebutoff) advanced with 8000 Russians and thirteen cannon from Erivan in the direction of Bayazeed, but Selim, instead of retiring to Kars, sallied out with his inferior force, to encounter the Russian army, and taking up a position in a defile, imagined that he was secure by crowning the eminences on his flanks. General Wrangel, however, bringing a much larger force to bear upon the Turkish centre, completely broke it through; and while his cavalry followed up the retreating and disordered Turks on the plain, his infantry by lateral movements intercepted the retreat of those who occupied the hills on the flanks. The intelligence of this event produced great dismay in the entrenched camp of Zarif Mustapha Pasha, for by the destruction of the right wing at Bayazeed, not only was the commercial communication with Persia cut off, but the central army was exposed to be taken in flank, General Wrangel having the choice of either joining Bebutoff, or of threatening Erzeroum. To avoid either contingency, it was resolved to risk a general engagement.

On the eve of the decisive battle of Kurukdereh, the Turkish army consisted of 20,000 infantry, 3700 cavalry, and 8000 or 10,000 Bashi-bazouks, who took no active part in the fight, with 78 guns: in all, nearly 35,000 men. The

Russian force was some 10,000 less. The plan of battle projected by General Guyon, and described by Mr. Duncan, was as follows:—the troops were to move forward by night, the Russian camp was to be menaced by two detachments of Bashi-bazouks, who were to attack it on the two flanks. The heights which covered the left wing were to be attacked and carried by five battalions of infantry, supported by some howitzers and a force of irregulars, while the main strength of the Ottoman army was to attack the Russian centre. The Bashi-bazouks had orders to march at twelve at night; the detachment of five battalions at one o'clock in the morning; and the main body at half-past one. The entire army was to be before the Russian camp at daybreak and attack it at once.

But although this plan was probably a very good one, the execution of it was wretched. Confusion took place in the ranks of the left division, and Zarif Mustapha Pasha commanded a halt until daylight. In the meanwhile the right division under Kerim Pasha marching onward to Kurukdereh found the whole Russian force drawn up in order of battle to receive them. The chance was too good to be thrown away by Bebutoff, who bore down in force upon the isolated Turkish right wing, while the left, several miles behind, was vainly marching in double quick time to remedy the fatal blunder of its previous movements. Thus, 10,000 Turks had to sustain the whole brunt of the Russian left and centre.

Kerim Pasha made the best of the dilemma, and withdrawing his troops to an eminence, prepared to resist the advance of the Russians and to await the arrival of Zarif Mustapha Pasha. The Turkish artillery behaved most admirably, the men stood to their guns, although abandoned by their own cavalry, and poured deadly volleys into the Russian ranks. But the Turkish infantry battalions, composed of militiamen, who saw fire for the first time, wavered under the discharge of the Russian cannon, and finally breaking their ranks fled wildly to Kars. Two charges of the Russian dragoons were unsuccessful, but at the third attack they reached the Turkish batteries; the artillery-men, defending their pieces till the last, fell to a man, but all the efforts of Kerim Pasha to rally his forces were in vain.

By this time the left wing had come up, but too late; at first they bore down with vigour upon the Russian right, but the dragoons on the left, recalled from their pursuit of the shattered battalions of Kerim, speedily turned the tide, notwithstanding the ability shown by General Kmety in the attack. Nothing indeed could retrieve the capital blunder committed at the outset. On all the line the Russian troops showed their

confidence and the Turks their demoralisation. In vain Guyon sought, at the head of a corps of cavalry to retrieve the fortunes of the day; a single Russian infantry battalion on an eminence was sufficient by its fire to make them retreat, while the cowardly Bagdad Bashi-bazouks, terrified at the execution of the Russian guns, dashed in wild panic through the ranks of the infantry. The whole army was now in full retreat; 3500 Turks were killed and wounded, 2000 prisoners and 15 cannon fell into the ranks of the enemy. But for the exhaustion of the Russian troops the Turkish loss must have been much larger. The Russian loss was also severe, amounting to above 3000 casualties by their own admission, the admirable Turkish artillery from the Dardanelles having been chiefly instrumental in somewhat retrieving the honour of the Turkish arms. 'Your infantry fought well,' said General Bebutoff to the Turkish Imaum at the burial of the dead, 'and your artillery is excellent; but the cavalry and your Bashi-bazouks are mere rabble.'

On the sea-coast the operations of the summer had been equally unsuccessful on the part of the Turks, who in the previous year had auspiciously commenced the campaign by the capture of Scheffketil and Ossurgheti, as we have already stated. On the 14th of June the Russians under General Prince Andronikoff, with eleven battalions of infantry, eight field pieces, ten hill cannon, 400 Cossacks and 2000 light troops, advanced upon Ossurgheti, from which the Turks retreated, and under another Selim Pasha, who is not to be confounded with the Selim of Bayazeed, took up a very strong position beyond the river Tcholok on precipitous ground. This gave the Turkish commander a false security. Surprised at four o'clock in the morning while asleep by a sudden attack of Prince Andronikoff, and also vigorously attacked in the left flank by two heavy columns commanded by Generals Maydel and Brunner, the Turks were thrown into confusion, and after a conflict in which both parties brought up their reserves, the Turks were completely defeated, and thirteen cannon, with all the baggage, fell into the Russian hands. Selim was recalled to Constantinople, and an inquest being held on his proceedings, he ingenuously defended himself by alleging that he was asleep, that his ammunition was deficient, and with respect to the thirteen cannon that were taken, 'rather than that should be a cause of annoyance, he would pay for them out of his own pocket!'

For was the foreign enemy the only one with which the forces of the Sultan had to contend; a most formidable intestine

revolt was added to the Asiatic complications. Among the various unruly component parts of the old Ottoman Empire which the genius of Omar Pasha had compelled to submission, involving regular taxation and conscription, was Kurdistan, a mountainous district of robber tribes who had been incited to rebellion at this most critical period. Such a leak sprung at the height of the tempest required no common handicraft, and in the hour of need an Englishman of genius was found to avert, or at least to suspend for a time, the progress of these calamities. The Kurdish chiefs were brought back, if not to obedience, at least to a cessation of hostilities, by the influence of a man whose name deserves to be pronounced with gratitude by the ministers of the Sultan, and with respect throughout Europe—we mean General Williams, the British military commissioner at Kars.

On the recall of Zarif Mustapha Pasha, this Vizier received a successor in the person of Vassif Pasha, an intelligent officer, with the British commissioner as his chief adviser. For this position Colonel Williams was well qualified, not only professionally, but from a lengthened practical knowledge of this part of Asia as one of the commissioners for the adjustment of the frontier between Persia and the Porte.

The essential basis of all the operations of the army of Asia is Erzeroum, where Colonel Williams arrived in September, that is to say, about a month after the fatal battle of Kurukdereh; and here his first care was directed to the comfort and health of the garrison, which had suffered severely from fever and deficiencies in food and habitation. Arrangements were made for the coming winter, provisions were stored, and the commercial khans temporarily appropriated to the troops, were repaired so as to afford some shelter against the severity of the climate.

At Kars he found the disorganised remains of the army of Kurukdereh. Anarchy had reigned here after this fatal event; the partial order which had been introduced by Haireddin Pasha had again given way to confusion and speculation. The troops, many months in arrear of pay, were suffering from fever, filth, and deficient nourishment. To these evils Colonel Williams sought to apply the adequate remedies—cessation of speculation, sanatory regulations, and supplies of provisions; the excessive difficulty of transport over snowy mountains rendered this last point one especially requiring provident attention at the beginning of winter. In the construction of the new and enlarged line of defences, not only wood, but even lime could scarcely be procured. The supply of ammunition was also de-

ficient in consequence of the difficulties of transport. In the new defences, which embraced all the heights immediately around the place, Colonel Williams was ably assisted by Major Teesdale, who supplied his place at Kars during the spring of 1854-5, until the arrival of Colonel Lake, to whose activity and skill the prompt completion of those extensive works was due. Colonel Williams himself then returned to Erzeroum for the winter, where he spent his time in strengthening its defences, and in pressing on caravan after caravan of provisions and stores to Kars.

From the first arrival of the British officers the deficiency of provisions in Kars had excited their strongest apprehensions. The Turkish authorities had grossly neglected to complete the necessary stores for the garrison at the commencement of the war. It is evident that the only effectual mode of victualling such a fortress as Kars is to buy up the corn of the neighbouring lands, as the difficulty of communication prevents the transport of bulky stores from a distance. But nothing was done; no measures had been taken to collect and appropriate the harvest for the use of the army. The trade in corn remained open, and a large portion of the produce of the lands about Kars was consigned, not to the use of the garrison of that fortress, but to the use of the enemy who was coming to besiege it. M. Fonton informs us that the Turks had committed the same blunder in 1828-29, and that it had contributed to the weakness of their defence; but no experience will correct their want of foresight and the venality of those who ought to protect the interests of the State.*

General Mouravieff, the same whom we have mentioned as the lieutenant of Paskiewitsch and the colleague of Burtzoff, had succeeded, in 1855, General Bebutoff in the command of the movable Asiatic army of Russia, now raised to 36,000 men. The general knew every inch of the ground, and without showing great genius of combination, no one can deny him the most stubborn perseverance and an amount of ability as a tactician which has sometimes excited the admiration of his less for-

* Mr. William Hamilton, whose researches in Asia Minor, Pontus, and Armenia are by far the most valuable geographical work we possess on these countries, made a similar remark when he visited Kars in 1836. He found the Russians at that time fortifying Gumri with great activity, and buying up large quantities of timber for that purpose from the Turks. Forty or fifty araba loads of timber were said to pass the frontier every day; and the peasants stated that it was then expected the work would be completed in seven years. (*Hamilton's Asia Minor*, vol. i. p. 206.)

tunate antagonists. On the 10th of June 1855, he entered into Turkish Armenia, in three columns directed upon Kars, Ardaghan, and Bayazeed; the first and largest being under his own immediate direction; but the Turks not daring to risk another defeat in the open country shrunk within the now formidable lines of Kars. On the other hand, Mouravieff, unwilling to undertake a regular siege of these defences after the lesson that Grach had taught the Russian engineers at Silistria, contented himself with a *reconnaissance en force* on the 16th of June, but was sharply handled by the Turkish cavalry and obliged to keep a more respectful distance. Yet although General Mouravieff attempted at this period neither a regular siege nor a strict blockade, the garrison was already made to feel the inconvenience of isolation. The Cossacks covered all the country far and near so as to straiten Vassif Pasha particularly in forage, and Mouravieff, puzzled as he was by the tactics of Williams and Lake, still felt that Kars was only a detached branch from the Turkish trunk by Erzeroum, and drawing all its sap from thence. He therefore left one part of his army to watch Kars and intercept its supplies; with the other part he crossed the undefended range of Saghanluk, and appearing before Erzeroum itself, though without attacking it, he produced the utmost alarm in all the north-east of Asia Minor.

But now was seen the results of the prudent and provident character of the mind of Williams. The Russian general here found himself in front of works which defied him, while he was too far advanced from his basis at Gumri not to have his communications continually cut off by the flying columns of Dashi-bazouks. That he counted confidently on surprising Erzeroum we cannot believe. But this remote incursion had the effect of interrupting the communications between Kars and Erzeroum; and there can be no doubt that the passage of Russian troops, with its scourge of irregulars, all tended to straiten the defenders of Kars, and thither Mouravieff returned with the rest of his army, in order to reduce the place by assault or blockade. Supplies of corn and rice still remained in the magazines, but without forage it was no longer possible to retain the cavalry; accordingly 1200 of this arm, with 200 beasts of burden, were sent out in the night of the 3rd September, and succeeded in passing the *cordon*, but being followed by the Russian cavalry on their road to Erzeroum, several hundreds of them were cut to pieces.

No sooner were the works completed which the British officers had contrived for the defence of the place, than Colonel Wil-

liams reported that he had nothing to fear from any assault of the Russians.

We have already described the ancient defences of Kars, which baffled the valour of Nadir Shah, and surrendered to Prince Paskiewitsch in three days. But the present fortifications comprise three times the extent of the original enceinte. The high ground on the left bank of the river to the north of Kars has been turned into a vast entrenched camp; and Fort Lake, a substantial closed redoubt, caps a hillock of this elevated plateau, which is the key of the position. Another line of works on the brows of the lower undulations about a mile to the westward, called the Tahmasb and Yuksek Tabias and Renison lines, secured that part of Kars against an attempt to repeat the siege operations of Paskiewitsch. On the right bank, on which is situated the town of Kars itself, the eminence called the Kara Dagb has been fortified in a scientific manner, so as to secure the town on the E. and S. E.; while a large star fort, called the Arab Tabia, overlooking the gully, connects the Kara Dagb with the English lines first mentioned. The extreme southern angle of the new enceinte is projected in the plain so as to include a hillock on which is built the Kauli Tabia.

General Williams, knowing that the ground on the left bank was the key of the place, and that the attack would probably be made in that quarter, suggested outer defences to the west of the fortress, which were constructed with energy and ability by Colonel Lake; and these entrenchments of Tahmasb being the nearest to the enemy, an officer of vigilance, experience, and energy was required for the command of them. The choice fell on General Kmety, who fully justified the appointment.

At length the garrison of Kars received the long-wished-for intelligence that Sebastopol had fallen, and that Omar Pasha had landed at Batoum, with a considerable portion of the Turkish army hitherto employed in the Crimea. This officer had long been anxious to proceed with his forces to Asia, and the British Government was of opinion that he could there perform the greatest service; but until the vast enterprise of the siege of Sebastopol was completed, Marshal Pellissier and General Simpson declined to weaken any part of the forces of the Allied armies. The fall of Sebastopol set Omar Pasha free. It is also probable that upon this event Mouravieff had received orders from St. Petersburg to attempt the capture of Kars without regard to the sacrifices it might involve. The trumpet of fame had sounded the success of the Allies through

the wide East, and the prestige of Russia had to be re-established with many nations of Asia absorbed in anxious contemplation of this Titanic struggle. Be this as it may, before the close of September it was resolved to storm the fortress, although it must have been well known to the besiegers that the place would infallibly fall by blockade and famine in a few weeks. Long lines of waggons, moving in the direction of Georgia, were paraded before the eyes of the garrison of Kars, as if a retreat were intended; but this did not relax the vigilance of the Anglo-Turkish leaders, and Colonel Lake was directed to strengthen several points in the extensive and undermanned lines.

The dispositions of General Mouravieff were as follows:— Three assaulting corps were formed, numbering each from 6000 to 8000 men. One was destined to attack the Tahmasb heights and batteries to the west of Kars; another the northern lines, of which Fort Lake is the key; while a third was to execute a feint and menace the town from the S. and S. W.; that is to say, lower down in the plain. The whole of the rest of the Russian army was under arms in reserve. These attacking corps were accompanied by artillery and cavalry, the latter force being intended, when the batteries were turned, to cut off the retreat of the Turks within the inner enceinte. Two bridges above Kars enabled the Russians to communicate with either bank. The attacks were to take place before daylight, consequently all the Russians were under arms shortly after midnight.

Long before the dawn of the memorable 29th of September, the experienced ear of the vigilant Kmety had recognised the distant rumble of artillery feebly breaking the silence of the night; and calling all his men to arms, he placed them at once in the batteries, whilst Vassif Pasha and General Williams collected the reserves in a central position close to the river, so that they could watch the southern plain, or be easily despatched across the bridges to the northern and western heights, as occasion might require. The Russian corps destined to attack the western batteries advanced, divided into three columns, one on the right to storm the Tahmasb redoubt itself; the one on the left to master the breastwork called the Benison lines; and the centre one to assail the Yuksek Tabia. Upward pressed the Russian masses in the dim obscurity, with a concert and an alacrity which defies criticism. On several previous occasions, as at Inkerman and the Tchernaya, a want of simultaneous action had been assigned as a reason for failure. No such cause could be alleged on this occasion; but wherever

the enemy appeared within range on these western heights every man was at his post waiting his opportunity. Showers of deadly grape opened from behind the works on the dense masses of helmeted infantry. The vigilance of Kmety had turned an intended surprise of Turks by Russians into a surprise of Russians by Turks. But surprise as it was, it came on officers whose minds had been previously steeled against the worst contingencies. Up the ensanguined hill they led the way, followed by their men with loud hurrahs athwart the storm of flanking musketry at pointblank range, and day slowly dawned from behind the heights of Kara-djuran on ranges of corpses symmetrically prostrate, like the field where the scythe of the mower has swept with irresistible force.

On the northern lines the Russian efforts were at first attended with a better prospect of success. At 5.30 A. M. a force which had moved from the village of Itchakmak attacked the redoubts and breastworks in that quarter with the utmost determination. The shallow fosse — the feeble numerical force of the defenders composed of Luz clansmen — and the large number of the assailants, amounting to from 6000 to 8000 men, with two batteries of eight guns each, and cavalry in proportion, enabled the Russians to master the lines and capture the flags which overhung them. But the key of all this side of Kars is the work already mentioned, Fort Lake, a closed redoubt of considerable profile, beyond the reach of any *coup de main*.

Master of the secure and central position of Fort Lake, the Turks had a refuge against all contingencies, and Captain Thompson commanding the perfectly inaccessible and unattacked position of the Kara Dagh, was enabled to spare two battalions from the right bank, who descending into the deep gully of the Kars river, and crossing one of the temporary bridges with which the communications were well kept up, ascended to the interior of the English lines on the northern heights, and uniting opportunely with the force under Lieutenant-Colonel Lake, drove the Russians out of the redoubts and down the hill. Nor was their retreat unmolested; Captain Thompson, overlooking the whole scene from his lofty eminence, removed a heavy gun from the eastern side of the hill, where it was not wanted, to the western, and vigorously plying the retreating Russian columns, performed most ably a service analogous to that of Colonel Dickson at Inkerman. All the other English batteries, as well as the star fort of Arab-Tabia, were equally active.

But we must now return to the western batteries, which from before daylight during the whole forenoon continued to be most hotly contested. Reckless of the profuse flow of

human blood, Mouravieff, with a dogged tenacity which Eylau did not see exceeded, sent reserve after reserve to these human shambles. In vain grape and round-shot made instantaneous lanes in the columns which were more slowly but surely riddled by the incessant crack of the Miniè rifle from the pits. The Tabias must be had, cost what they might; and it seemed as if the assault of an Asiatic Malakoff was destined to avenge upon the hill of Kara, the contest which had so recently terminated under the walls of Sebastopol. The works called Renison and Yuksack told fearfully on the Russians; the former covering 450 trained Miniè riflemen, whose steady and fatal fire completely broke the enemy and sent him headlong down the hill leaving 850 bodies on this one spot; but at Tahmasb the right column of Russians for a time succeeded in turning the battery, while the advanced artillery of the enemy opened at the rear of the closed redoubt at its salient angle, the infantry penetrating considerably behind the Turkish position.

Nothing can be clearer and more graphic than Colonel Williams' own account of the salvation of the line at this most critical juncture:—

‘Observing the commencement of this movement, and anticipating its consequences, Lieutenant-colonel Lake, who had taken the direction of affairs in the English Tabias, was instructed to send a battalion from Fort Lake to the assistance of the defenders of Tahmasb, and at the same time two battalions of the reserves were moved across the flying bridge and upon the rocky height of Laz Jeppé Tabia. These three reinforcing columns met each other at that point, and being hidden from the enemy by the rocky nature of the ground, confronted him at a most opportune moment; they deployed, opened their fire, which stopped and soon drove back the enemy's reserves, which were then vigorously charged with the bayonet, at the same moment when General Kmety and Major Teesdale issued from the redoubts at Tahmasb and charged the assailants. The whole of that portion of the enemy's infantry and artillery now broke and fled down the heights under a murderous fire of musketry; this occurred at half past eleven, after a combat of seven hours.

‘In this part of the field the enemy had, including his reserves, twenty-two battalions of infantry, a large force of dragoons and Cossacks, together with thirty-two guns.’

Such was the 29th of September—a day glorious and memorable in the history of the operations of the Allied armies, and worthy to be remembered with Alma, Inkermann, the Tchernaya, and Sebastopol. Nor in our admiration of Vassif, of Kmety, of Williams, and their brave companions, can we refuse the tribute of our respect for valour so dogged and so unflinching as that which the Russians showed during seven

successive hours without cover or shelter, at a sacrifice variously estimated at from 6,000 to 10,000 men, and confessed by themselves to exceed the former number. Unhappily, however, the signal bravery and indomitable perseverance of this defence were not destined to save the town. It had been hoped that the assault of Kars on the 29th of September was a final and desperate effort of the Russian army, and that on the failure of this attack the siege might be raised. But General Mouravieff was too well acquainted with the hopeless condition of the garrison from want of food to relinquish the beleaguered city; and after his defeat upon the Taurus he resumed the blockade with increased rigour. For seven months no stores of any importance had been introduced into the place. The cold of autumn had already set in, and the ridge of Saghaneluk, between Kars and Erzeroum, was crested with snow. Exposure and want of nourishment had decimated the garrison, for typhus and cholera never ceased to rage within the walls. The wretched carcasses of the horses of the army had been eaten; no animal food could be procured except the vermin of the citadel; — a half-starved cat was sold for 100 piastres. The famishing soldiers attempted, even under the fire of the enemy, to dig up the half-decomposed remains of buried animals; and on the last day of the siege eighty men perished from inanition. The Russians had completed the investment of the place; their advanced patrols were far on the road to Erzeroum, and the attempt made by Vely Pacha and Selim Pacha to advance from Trebizond to the relief of Kars was defeated by the detachment of General Soussloff, which threatened the relieving army in the rear. Under these distressing and hopeless circumstances General Williams, on the 24th of November, sent in his aide-de-camp, Major Teesdale, to the Russian camp to treat for surrender. On the following day an interview took place between the two commanders, and the preliminaries of the capitulation were signed; on the 28th all was completed. The terms of capitulation were equally honourable to the magnanimity of the conquerors and to the heroism of the vanquished. The remains of the army of Anatolia marched out of Kars, with their arms, standards, and drums, to the number of 6000 redifs, who were suffered to depart to their homes on condition of not bearing arms in the present contest, and 7000 or 8000 regular Turkish troops, who were detained as prisoners of war. The British officers appear to have been sent for the present to Tiflis; General Kmety had the good fortune to escape to Erzeroum.

Such was the termination of this memorable siege, which proved nothing was wanting to the defence of this bulwark of the Turkish empire but those stores without which the very existence

of the garrison became impossible. It throws a deep reproach on those who are most directly responsible for the direction and supply of the Turkish armies in Asia, that no vigorous attempt was made to rescue General Williams and his valiant coadjutors of all ranks from the critical position they so long defended; and we do not scruple to admit that the loss of Kars is the principal advantage the Russians have gained since the commencement of the war. Much has been said, and much more will probably be said, of the culpable apathy alleged to have been shown by the Allied Powers in the relief of Kars; and the Porte has proved its sense of the conduct of Selim Pasha, who commanded at Erzeroum, by calling upon him to answer for his neglect before a court-martial. But before we proceed to draw any rash inference from this disaster, it is necessary to show what could have been done to avert it. Kars fell, not from the insufficiency of its defences, but from the want of provisions. The only effectual means of saving the place would have been to defeat Mouravieff at the head of his army, or at least to compel him to retreat, and to throw stores into the place. Were these means in our power? We presume it will hardly be contended that, in the state of affairs in the Crimea, the allied commanders would have been justified in detaching a considerable portion of their European forces to operate, without preparation, on an entirely new basis in Asia; and, even if it had been possible to send troops there, the difficulty of providing supplies for the army would only have increased in the same ratio as the numbers of the allied forces. The Turkish commanders and administrators of the army in Asia Minor alone had it in their power to do something to prevent this great loss; and they unhappily left Kars to its fate, when no one else could assist that heroic garrison. Selim Pasha even refused to accept the offer of Colonel Stewart to lead a force for the relief of the place.

Meanwhile Omar Pasha had not been inactive on the coast, but it is a popular error to call his force the relieving army of Kars. The intention to relieve Kars is not to be elicited from any of his proceedings, otherwise he would have gone in the direction of that place, either by Trebizond and Erzeroum, along the regular military roads, or would have hazarded the more direct hill tracks from Batoum. He had, in the first instance, serious difficulties to surmount after landing at Suchum Kaleh from the want of transport, as well as from the disastrous sickness which had ravaged the Turkish force on that coast of fatal fevers. Even when these difficulties were surmounted, his proceedings appear to have been directed to the possession of a secure military and political basis in Abassia

and Mingrelia, rather than to an onward march into the interior, which might seriously divert the forces of Mouravieff from the blockade. The operation which he has performed was not that which the critical position of the army at Kars imperiously required. Omar Pasha deserves credit for securing local political alliances, for preserving discipline in his army in strong contrast to what these populations had previously experienced of Turkish troops, and for the skill with which his force was handled in actual contest; but it was altogether beyond his power to penetrate the valley of the Tchorok, and to cross the lofty ridges of the Armenian highlands, in the month of October, with the means of transport at his disposal.

Souchoum Kaleh, lying immediately under the mountains of Abassia and yet in the vicinity of the principal road to the interior of Mingrelia, is a secure and convenient political as well as military basis. Redout Kaleh as the terminus of the military road from the Black Sea through Mingrelia to Georgia, is the nearest of these eastern ports to Kutais, but this latter point being held by Russia, as well as the banks of the Inghour and the Riom, the communication of the Turkish corps in Ghuriel with the headquarters of Omar Pasha at Tchimschura or Shemsherrai, not far from Souchoum Kaleh, could only be kept up by the seaports; in other words, the land basis was incomplete, and it was to connect the corps of Omar Pasha with that in Gurriel that the passage of the Inghour was undertaken.

In the end of October Omar Pasha advanced from Tchimschura to the Ertiss-tchai, in the direction of Mingrelia, where a standing bridge was constructed to secure the passage of this river; and on the 1st of November he moved forward through a wooded and swampy country to the banks of the Inghour, which, rising in the snowy Caucasus, winds through forests to its mouth at Anaklia. At the castle of Ruchj, on the left bank, the Russians had raised entrenchments to guard the access to Mingrelia. Opposite this point the army of Omar Pasha, amounting to 20,000 men with twenty-seven field pieces and ten mounted guns, took up its post with a view of forcing a passage in the face of, it is true, a numerically inferior Russian force, but advantageously placed and protected by the fort on the eminence. A battery was ordered to be constructed opposite the principal Russian position; and being promptly armed during the night of the 5th, it was on the morning of the 6th able to commence its fire. The main central corps of Omar Pasha, led by Colonel Ballard, passed to an island, where he had a sharp encounter with Mingrelian militia; but, to avoid crossing in the teeth of entrenchments to the left bank of

the Inghour, under a galling fire, fords were sought to the right and left so as to evade the heavy loss of a direct attack. The corps to the left, very ably led up the river bank by Colonel Simmons, crossed unresisted; and going down on the other side, through a wood, fell unexpectedly on the rear of the Russian entrenchments, simultaneously with the vigorous front attack under Omar himself. Thus surprised, the enemy broke and fled, leaving three guns in the hands of Colonel Simmons, who appears to have conducted this operation with perfect skill. At the same time, Osman Pasha performing a similar operation at the lower ford, the Russians, taken in front and on both flanks, had no choice but precipitately to yield the ground, of which the Turks were entirely masters at nightfall, thus opening the way to Sugdidi, and compelling the Russians to gather themselves more closely around Kutais. The Russian casualties on this occasion appear to have amounted to many hundreds. The passage of the Inghour was not an operation of magnitude equivalent to several others during the war, but in none have the arrangements been distinguished by more perfect adequacy to the objects in view.

The successful operation of Omar Pasha on the Inghour, and his subsequent advance upon Khoni, afford another proof of the ability of that general in framing strategical combinations, which it is within the power of his army to perform; but he appears to have been unable to hold his ground or to advance on Kutais, and has retired on Suchum Kalch since the fall of Kars. His position serves to indicate the strategical direction of the operations which may be undertaken in another Asiatic campaign. It is of the utmost consequence to convince our statesmen, our generals, and the allied nations which are engaged in this war, that since the destruction of the Russian stronghold in the Crimea, no part of our operations is of greater consequence than the conduct of hostilities in Asia. We are not speaking of the direct advantages arising to ourselves from such operations, although these are considerable, for the port of Trebizond receives annually to the value of more than a million of our produce, and the roads connecting the harbours of Asia Minor with Persia and the great valley of the Euphrates, are cut off at this moment by the advanced positions of the Russian army at Gumri, Kars, and Bayazeed. But the whole Transcaucasian region lying between the Euxine and the Caspian forms a country singularly fitted for military defence, for national independence, and for commercial prosperity. The population is in great part Christian. The soil of the plains and valleys is fertile, and the climate favourable to every kind of produce. Should the

present war be prolonged by the obstinate refusal of Russia to accede to the terms of peace, the objects of the Allied Powers must naturally increase; and probably none would contribute more powerfully to the security of the Ottoman Empire and the progress of civilisation in the East, than the restoration of the principalities of Georgia and the neighbouring provinces to the full possession of their government, under the guarantee of the allied powers. If the Moldo-Wallachian provinces in the West, and the Georgian provinces in the East, can be raised into a barrier of semi-independent Christian states, Turkey and Russia would cease to be contiguous, and the danger which has so long impended over the Ottoman dominions would be removed.*

* The Western Transcaucasian provinces are inhabited by the Georgian and Armenian races. Baron Huxthausen estimates the Georgian population of these countries at 600,000, and the indigenous Armenian population at nearly 300,000. These people, though incorporated in the Russian empire for more than half a century, have retained a considerable share of their traditional independence. For instance, in Mingrelia the Dadian is sovereign of the country, though nominally holding under Russia. It is of great interest to ascertain how far these primitive tribes and princes are capable of independence. Could they remain unmolested whilst markets are opened on the Eastern coasts of the Euxine, a few years would change the face of the country, and restore it to civilisation.

The population of Eastern Transcaucasia, bordering on the Caspian, is Tartar, wild, fanatical, and hostile to all strangers. Schamyl and his Murids, or the Leshgian mountaineers, who sometimes threaten the environs of Tiflis with a raid, have excited the enthusiasm of Europe by their spirited resistance to the common enemy; but it is a complete delusion to imagine that any reliance can be placed on these highlanders of the Caucasus. They fight for plunder, from a clannish spirit, and from a love of independence. The present war has been of use to them, because it has supplied them with arms, and compelled the Russians to evacuate their forts on the coast. But Schamyl and his followers would be found just as hostile to any other race of intruders, or any other form of authority, as they have been to the Russians. If government, trade, and civilisation are ever to be introduced into these regions, it must be by the increased security and power of the Christian population.

Whilst these pages are passing through the press, we receive a very forcible confirmation of our views from the Preface to the second edition of Mr. Oliphant's pamphlet, dated from the Turkish camp at Sugdidi in Mingrelia. This gentleman was one of the first persons to point out the importance and feasibility of a campaign in Asia, and he has since accompanied Omar Pasha in his recent expedition. On Mr. Oliphant's authority, then, we repeat, that the people of the Transcaucasian provinces (with the exception of Abkhazia) are entirely Christians; they look with extreme distrust upon the progress of a

But little has yet been done for the accomplishment of any such enlarged political design. The Moldo-Wallachian provinces are still under an Austrian occupation and a Russian hospodar; and in Asia the disasters of the campaigns of 1854 and 1855 have placed Russia in a more advantageous position than she held before the war. The fall of Kars has rendered this fact palpable to all the world, and it cannot fail to produce a most injurious effect throughout Asia on the cause of the allies. The causes of this unfortunate state of affairs have already been briefly adverted to in the preceding pages. Throughout the war, the armies in Asia have suffered from the want of unity of command. Every corps was divided between jealous generals and corrupt or cowardly pashas, none of whom cared to postpone their own lucre or safety to the public service. Even in the staff of the forces at headquarters, the same fatal divisions prevailed. Turks, Poles, Hungarians, and English officers, were contending for the ascendancy, and no man had the authority or the genius to subdue these elements of discord. At one time General Guyon's energy rescued the army of Anatolia from dissolution; but he had no real power, and the battle of Kurukdereh was lost in defiance of his advice. At another time General Williams had succeeded in putting Kars in a complete state of defence, but the neglect of the necessary stores in the previous season, and the treachery or indifference of those who might have made an effort to relieve that fortress, rendered even this memorable defence of no avail. Kars has been lost, part of the Turkish army has been sacrificed, and the lustre of the arms of the allied forces has been dimmed, principally by the disgraceful personal jealousies which are the bane of combined operations. In the last volume of his history, M. Thiers has given the world a striking picture of the discord existing in Spain between Massena, Soult, Suchet, and Ney, whose want of sincere co-operation was more ruinous to the French army than even the genius of the Duke of Wellington: yet these generals were the lieutenants of one man, exercising unlimited power, directing their movements, rewarding their successes, and punishing their faults. How much more are similar divisions to be apprehended between commanders serving such a government as the Porte, frequently degraded by the vices of the Turkish administration, and required to act in concert with men of different nations, characters, and pretensions!

Turkish army; but they would hail the arrival of a Christian power destined to free them from the bondage of Russia without subjecting them to the still more dreaded yoke of a Musaulman power.

How much are these difficulties aggravated when distinct military operations are being carried on at several different points; when the Allied Powers are represented by their ambassadors in one place, their generals in another, and their admirals in a third; and when no result can be secured without a power sufficient to reduce these distinct forces to harmonious action! The Governments of England and France, acting at a great distance from the seat of war, have in reality less responsibility in this matter than their agents abroad, for throughout the war their policy has been, as far as possible, to point out the great objects of attainment, but to leave to the discretion of the superior officers on the spot the means of accomplishing them. Nothing is more mischievous than to attempt to regulate from a distance the incidents of a campaign. If want of alacrity has been shown in any quarter in pushing forward to the relief of Kars, the heavy responsibility of contributing to the loss of that important position and its brave defenders must rest upon those who were guilty of this neglect; but we are persuaded that no indifference was felt by the British Government as to this part of the contest, though the military authorities in France were less impressed with the necessity of protecting the Turkish frontier in Asia Minor. The obstacles to this course of action have for the present baffled our exertions; but they have also taught us the necessity of surmounting them; and the most effectual means of permanently protecting Asia Minor from the incursions of Russia would be to throw back her frontier to the Caucasus. We agree with Mr. Oliphant that if this war is prolonged, 'the fifth point should be, that between the Black Sea and the Caspian, the Terek and the Kouban do henceforward form the frontier of Russia.' That would be the severest blow we can inflict on her means of aggression on the side of Asia; and it is an object which the British and Anglo-Turkish forces now in the East would probably suffice to accomplish. The time is approaching when it will be expedient that the gallant armies of France and England, which have learned to do honour to their mutual worth at the joint siege of Sebastopol, should pursue distinct military lines of operation; and, whilst France is perfectly able to check the forces of the enemy in the West, it would naturally devolve on this country to arrest her progress in the East.

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
APRIL, 1856.

No. CCX.

- ART. I.—1. *History of England, from the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Versailles.* By Lord MAHON [now Earl Stanhope]. Vol. VII. (1780–1783). 8vo. London: 1854.
2. *Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox.* Edited by Lord JOHN RUSSELL. Vol. III. 8vo. London: 1854.
3. *Memoirs of the Court and Cabinets of George the Third, from original Family Documents.* By the Duke of BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS, K.G. Vols. III. and IV. 8vo. London: 1855.
4. *Memoirs of the Whig Party during my Time.* By HENRY RICHARD Lord HOLLAND. Edited by his Son, HENRY EDWARD Lord HOLLAND. Vol. II. 8vo. London: 1854.*

WE have, in a former Number (Jan. 1854), given an account of the first two volumes of the Memoirs of Mr. Fox, edited by Lord John Russell, as well as of the letters published by the Duke of Buckingham, and, with their assistance, we followed the course of the important political changes which took place, in this country, between the American war and the commencement of Mr. Pitt's long ministry. Since the appearance of that Article the seventh volume of Lord Stanhope's History has been published, which concludes his useful and

* Mr. Justice Buller's name has met with an unlucky fate in the recently published memoirs. The editor of the 'Buckingham Papers' has converted him into 'Judge Miller,' while in Lord Holland's 'Memoirs of the Whig Party' his name appears twice as 'Judge Baker.' (Vol. i. pp. 122. 124.)

meritorious work, and brings down the narrative to the peace of 1783. As Lord Stanhope has completed the period of seventy years which he proposed to comprise in his history, we trust that he will undertake the succeeding period of thirty-two years, to the Peace of 1815, for no writer is more highly qualified to treat those memorable events dispassionately and effectively; and it is disgraceful to our literature that the long administration of Mr. Pitt should only be recorded in the platitudes of Gifford, the imposture of Tomline, or the superficial tirades of Sir A. Alison. Lord John Russell has recently added a third volume to the *Memoirs of Mr. Fox*, which, with the exception of a few introductory remarks by the editor, consists exclusively of letters written by Mr. Fox to his nephew, Lord Holland, and to some of his personal and political friends, between the years 1792 and 1804. This was the least active part of Mr. Fox's political life. During these years he not only held no office, but he absented himself to a great extent from the House of Commons, and stood aloof from parliamentary conflicts. His letters are those of a bystander and an observer of political events, rather than of an actor in them. Hence the third volume contains fewer materials for history than the two preceding ones; but, on the other hand, it exhibits a fuller and more detailed picture of Mr. Fox's mind and thoughts, and is more interesting, as a biography, than its predecessors. Mr. Fox's natural tastes evidently inclined him to literature rather than to politics; and, notwithstanding the life of vehement excitement, both in private and public, which he led for many years,—notwithstanding his eminent success as an orator, as a party leader, and as a tribune of the people,—he retained an ardent fondness and a keen relish for literary pursuits not always to be found even in persons who have passed their days in seclusion without aptitude for public life or experience of its agitations.

The correspondence in the two concluding volumes of the Duke of Buckingham's publication is of the same character as that in the preceding volumes, and is continued to the year 1810. We are happy to say that the task of editing the two last volumes has been transferred to competent hands, and that they are free from the ridiculous blunders which deformed the earlier part.

The second volume of Lord Holland's '*Memoirs of the Whig Party*' is principally occupied with an account of the formation, acts, and dismissal of the Ministry of 1806; it contains likewise some interesting notices of events of an earlier date, to which we shall advert in this Article.

The character of the political period which occupied the active part of Mr. Fox's career, was that of a struggle between the Crown and the independent section of Parliament. This independent section consisted partly of peers and partly of commoners; nearly all of whom, in whichever House they sat, were Whigs. The Tories were in general at this time friendly to the King, and desirous of maintaining unimpaired the influence of the Crown, which the Whigs, on the other hand, desired to restrict and diminish. The position of these parties had been completely inverted since the reigns of the two first Georges, when the Whigs were the main supporters of the Hanoverian interest, and the Tories were Jacobites, forming the Country Party, in active opposition to the Court. But during the American war George III. relied for support upon the chiefs of the Tories, while the Whigs, in both Houses of Parliament, carried on an unintermitting, active, and formidable opposition to his policy, his ministers, and his influence. We who witness the working of our parliamentary system in its maturity, may think that the event of this struggle could never have been doubtful. But Fox, who had fought in the front ranks of the battle, and knew the strength and compactness of the phalanx against which he had to contend, was perpetually haunted with the fear of the King's predominance, and the triumph of the influence of the Crown. In alluding to the King he recurs in his letters more than once to the pregnant words in which Dante expresses the Divine omnipotence: 'Vuolsi così colà dove si puote Ciò che si vuole.*'

* Dr. Johnson, who was a professed Tory, and who used to speak of 'Whig dogs,' 'detested the idea of governing by parliamentary corruption, and asserted most strenuously that a prince, steadily and 'conspicuously pursuing the interests of his people, could not fail of 'parliamentary concurrence. A prince of ability, he contended, 'might and should be the directing soul and spirit of his own administration; *in short, his own minister, and not the mere head of a party*; and then, and not till then, would the royal dignity be sincerely respected.' (*Boswell's Johnson*, under the year, 1770.) This passage contains a distinct expression of the view that a constitutional king, with limited powers, ought to govern as well as to reign. Johnson, however, did not see that if a king is his own minister he must be a party leader, and must abandon the neutral ground which is the true strength of a constitutional prince. In an article on the regency question, by Mr. Allen, published in this Journal in 1811, is the following passage:—'It appears to us that the same expediency 'which has subjected our kings, in their judiciary and legislative 'capacities, to the guidance of others, ought to regulate their selection 'of the persons who are fittest to govern the State, and direct its

During the reign of George III. the great Tory peers and patrons of boroughs, who, by their influence in counties, and their direct power of nomination, commanded the votes of a large section of the House of Commons, were willing, in general, to support any ministry which the King appointed, and to permit all the influence of the Crown to be exercised in its favour, provided that their own personal wishes respecting the distribution of patronage received due attention. They contented themselves as politicians with a barter of power for patronage; they gave the former, and received the latter. The great Whig lords, however, made a harder bargain with the Crown. They insisted upon selecting the King's Ministers before they consented to support them. They required that an administration should be formed of members of their own party, whose names should be proposed by their own leaders. This pretension has often been denounced as an improper and unconstitutional assumption of power; and the Whigs are described as setting up an oligarchical dominion to overawe the King and Parliament. It is likewise alleged that in confining their choice to members of the prominent Whig families, they showed a peculiarly aristocratic bias. Lord Stanhope, in his History, frequently exhibits the Whigs in this unfavourable light. Thus, after having described the arrangement by which the Marquis of Rockingham was made First Lord of the Treasury, in 1765, he points out that Lord Rockingham was one of the greatest landholders in England; that his talents were not above mediocrity, and that he was totally deficient in the power of public speaking, but admits that 'he had clear good sense and judgment, improved by the transaction of business. His character was without a stain, marked by probity and honour, by fidelity to his engagements, and by attachment to his friends.' He then proceeds to make these observations:—

* Such was the man whom the Whig party of 1765 selected from their ranks for their leader. Such was the man to whom they continued their allegiance in every variety of fortune during eighteen years. The selection might surprise us more were it not in some measure characteristic of that party. Since parties were formed

'affairs to the honour, safety, and advantage of the kingdom. We are sensible, however, that a contrary sentiment is very prevalent in the country; and, in our apprehension, the difference of opinion upon this point constitutes one of the chief distinctions between the Whigs and Tories of the present day.' (*Edinburgh Review*, vol. III. p. 4.) We doubt whether this distinction can be said to exist between the Whigs and Tories of our day. The Tories seem to us to have adopted the Whig opinion.

anew, though under the old names, early in the reign of George III., *it has been the boast of the Tories that with them family and fortune have been no necessary qualities of leadership*, that many an esquire of no ancient lineage, or a younger son of no broad domains, and relying on no merits save his own, has been with joyful assent raised far above the heads of the wealthiest and proudest among them. The same boast, at least not to the same degree, could scarcely, perhaps, be made by their opponents. We find the Whigs most frequently prefer for chiefs the *Porphyrogennets*, as the Byzantines might have termed them, men born and bred in purple,—the Marquis of Rockingham, or the Duke of Portland, or, in our own times, Lord Althorp,—men, no doubt, of irreproachable character, public and private, and of excellent plain sense, but still without one single ray of eloquence or spark of genius. “Thoughts that breathe and “words that burn” have been far less sought in the selection than high-sounding titles and rich acres. Above all, it seemed to be imagined that a certain small cluster of great houses, as the original Whig junta, should have the first choice of honours and employments.” (Vol. v. c. 44.)

Again, Lord Stanhope speaks of the King, upon the formation of the Rockingham Administration, in 1782, as ‘contem-
‘plating, with the utmost aversion, his return to the oligarchy
‘of the great Whig houses’ (vol. vii. p. 207.). And he thus characterises the Tory and Whig parties of that time:—

‘On viewing the two principal parties then in conflict—Lord North’s and Lord Rockingham’s, we can scarcely call either generous and large-minded on every point, and so far as regards both men and measures. Lord North’s party had some narrow views of national policy, *but it freely welcomed to its high places high ability, however unconnected*. Lord Rockingham’s, on the contrary, was more liberal in its political opinions, but as to men of genius, if low-born, it would receive them only as its servants and retainers; it almost avowedly regarded power as an heirloom in certain houses.’ (Vol. vii. p. 210.)

The choice of the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, under the Rockingham Administration, is thus described:—

‘Ireland at that time needed, beyond a question, for its Lord-Lieutenant a great statesman. The new Whig administration sent thither only a great duke. They selected his Grace of Portland, not for ability, not for activity, not for knowledge, not for eloquence, *for of all these he was utterly destitute*, but for his rank and wealth, and, above all, as the head of one of their principal “Revolution families.”’ (Vol. vii. p. 232.)

Upon the death of Lord Rockingham Fox objected to Lord Shelburne as First Minister, but abstained from urging his own claims to that post, and proposed the Duke of Portland to the King. Upon this step Lord Stanhope comments as follows:—

'Had Fox desired to put himself in competition with Shelburne for the Treasury, his preeminent abilities and his well-won lead in the House of Commons would have warranted his claim. But to run all risks of discord and division by proposing another man whose main merit lay in this, that he was the Lord of Welbeck, and had married a daughter of the House of Devonshire; to put forward in his stead a mere ducal puppet, whose strings others were to pull, seems a course which, however conformable to the precedents of his party, was, and I trust ever will be, repugnant to the spirit of his nation.' (Vol. vii. p. 271.)

Again, after the King had been forced to submit to the Coalition Government of Fox and Lord North in 1783, he is described as 'chafing at the dominion, so long eluded, of the 'great Whig houses.' (*Ib.* p. 307.)

It was quite natural that the King should, in 1782 and 1783, contemplate, with the utmost aversion, a return to the oligarchy of the great Whig houses, and should chafe at their dominion. What he desired was, to continue the oligarchy of the great Tory houses. Between these two oligarchies there was, as he well knew, this great difference, that whereas the Tories submitted themselves absolutely to his will, the Whigs gave him only a conditional support; they insisted on his Government acting upon their political principles, and being formed of persons who would carry those principles into effect, though they might be unpalatable to the Crown. Lord Stanhope seems to represent the leaders of the Whig party as dull men, with ancient families, and large hereditary estates in land; and the leaders of the Tory party as poor and low-born men of genius. We are at a loss to discover the facts on which this antithesis is founded. The Government of Lord North, which began in 1770, and lasted for twelve years, was a Tory Government. The Prime Minister (who also held the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer) was the eldest son of an Earl; the three Secretaries of State were the Earl of Rochford, Viscount Weymouth, and the Earl of Hillsborough; the President of the Council was Earl Gower; the Earl of Halifax was Privy Seal; the Great Seal was in commission from Jan. 1770 to Jan. 1771, when Earl Bathurst was appointed Lord Chancellor. Sir Edward Hawke, a celebrated naval man, was, indeed, continued in the post of First Lord of the Admiralty for nearly a year; but he was then replaced by the Earl of Sandwich. During the twelve years of Lord North's Administration, the only commoners who held the office of Secretary of State were Lord G. Germaine, the son of a Duke, and himself created a Viscount upon his resignation; and Mr. Welbore Ellis, afterwards Lord Mendip, who retained his seals only a few weeks. The other Secretaries

of State were, Viscount Weymouth (twice), Earl of Rochford, Earl of Dartmouth, Earl of Sandwich, Earl of Halifax, Earl of Suffolk, Viscount Stormont, and Earl of Hillsborough.* There is nothing in this cast of parts to betoken the ascendancy of plebeian genius and the exclusion of patrician mediocrity; or to show that 'Lord North's party freely welcomed to its high places high ability, however unconnected.'

When the King turned out the Coalition Administration in 1783, and brought in Mr. Pitt, the new Minister may not, in strictness, have been a Tory; but he had separated himself from the Whig party, and he came into power in direct hostility to Mr. Fox. With the single exception of himself, he formed a Cabinet of peers exclusively. He was at that time the only member of his own Cabinet in the House of Commons; and he himself was the son of an Earl, though we do not mean to assert that he owed his position in Parliament to his rank. We presume that Lord Stanhope does not allude to Mr. Addington when he speaks of plebeian genius rising to the leadership of the Tories, and that he does not see anything creditable either to the nation or the party, in the manner in which this favourite of George III. succeeded to Mr. Pitt's office in 1801.

Lord Stanhope severely blames the appointment of the Duke of Portland to the Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland in 1782, a time which he justly characterises as one of great difficulty; and he attributes it to mere considerations of property and family connexion. But it must be remarked that, although the Duke of Portland is described as utterly destitute of ability, activity, knowledge, and eloquence, Mr. Pitt was, notwithstanding these signal wants, glad to receive him into his Cabinet, and to confer upon him the office of Secretary of State for the Home Department, when with Burke he seceded from Mr. Fox and the rest of the Whigs in consequence of the French Revolution.† The Duke of Portland held this office

* 'Lord Weymouth had good natural abilities, and an easy flow of eloquence, which, combined with a graceful person, pleased the House of Lords; but he wanted steady application, and had injured his health by his taste for gaming and drinking.' (*Lord Stanhope*, vol. v. p. 292.) Earl of Suffolk, 'pompous and shallow.' *Ibid.* p. 293.)

† We learn, from the biographer of Mr. Windham, that the Duke of Portland was at first unwilling to become a member of Mr. Pitt's cabinet, and that Mr. Windham (who formed part of the same secession) was to have been Secretary of State; 'but at length, the Duke of Portland's reluctance to accept office having been overcome, it was thought proper, in consideration of his high rank and influence

from 1794 to 1801, at which time he became President of the Council, in the Addington Administration; and he filled the same post for a time under the subsequent short administration of Mr. Pitt. Upon the fall of the Government of 1806, he became Prime Minister in a Cabinet of which Mr. Perceval, Mr. Canning, and Mr. Vansittart were the leading members; and he remained in this position until his death, in 1809. It is evident, therefore, that, whatever may have been the Duke of Portland's deficiencies, the blame of appointing him to high offices does not rest exclusively with the Whigs, and must be shared, to at least an equal amount, by the Tories; and that the strings of this 'ducal puppet' were pulled as much by one party as by the other.*

When we compare the Whig and Tory parties in the reign of George III., we cannot perceive that the former was characterised by the scantiness, and the latter by the abundance, of its talent; and we certainly were under the impression that the Tories prided themselves on their connexion with the land, and reproached the Whigs with their alleged preference for the manufacturing and commercial interests. Lord Stanhope, pointing out the unfitness of Lord Rockingham for the post of Prime Minister, remarks, that his panegyrists were frequently compelled to rely on the merits of his large estate; one of whom (Burke) bids us recollect 'his Lordship's great interest in the 'public welfare, in quality of one of the greatest landholders in

'in the country, to place him in the office which had been intended 'for Mr. Windham, the latter consenting to accept the inferior one 'of Secretary at War, with a seat in the Cabinet.' (*Windham's Life*, prefixed to his 'Speeches,' vol. i. p. 35.) Lord Holland's account of the Duke of Portland may be seen in his 'Memoirs of the 'Whig Party,' vol. i. p. 72. He says, that when the Duke joined Mr. Pitt, 'he felt great repugnance to accepting office, and at least as 'great to resigning it. He was the last of his set to give his consent to either measure.' George III., in a letter to Mr. Addington of Feb. 5. 1801, alluding to the Duke of Portland, speaks of 'the fair 'part he has acted since in office,' upon which Dean Pellet (who cannot be accused of any Whig tendencies) remarks:—'The author 'cannot let this opportunity pass without observing how well this 'compliment was deserved by the nobleman in question. The period 'produced politicians probably of greater ability, but of higher integrity none.' (*Life of Lord Sidmouth*, vol. i. p. 295.)

* From the important part which the Duke of Portland played in the politics of this country for a long period, it might have been expected that his papers, if they were regularly preserved, would have thrown much light on the history of the time. We regret, however, to learn that they were all destroyed by his son, the late Duke.

‘England.’ For our own part, we agree with Lord Stanhope in thinking that large landed property is not a qualification for the office of Prime Minister; but we doubt whether that opinion was held by the majority of Englishmen in 1765, or, indeed, whether it is held by them at present. At all events, if Lord Derby should again become Prime Minister, we feel certain that the general voice of the Tories would ‘bid us re-collect his Lordship’s great interest in the public welfare, in quality of one of the greatest landholders in England.’

But, whatever may have been the inclinations of the two parties, the King did not prefer the Tories on account of their democratic tendencies. He chafed at the oligarchy of the Whig houses, because the Whigs put a bit in his mouth; whereas the Tory party was a quiet beast of burden, which the King could ride or drive as he pleased. The real contest in those days was, not between aristocracy and democracy, but between aristocracy and monarchy. The Tories were, at least, as much aristocrats as the Whigs; but they submitted to the dominion of the King. The Whigs sought to maintain a Parliamentary party, independent of the King’s personal influence, and to establish its supremacy over the royal will. This state of things is marked in the following verses of the *Rolliad*:—

‘When secret influence expiring lay,
And Whigs triumphant hail’d the auspicious day.’

The great Whig houses may have been an oligarchy, but they fought the battle of the people against the Crown; and where such vast means of corruption existed as the Crown possessed in the first twenty years of the reign of George III., the possession of rich acres, which Lord Stanhope holds so cheap as a political instrument, was of material assistance for carrying on the war against the Court and the Ministry combined. The pretension which they made, of naming the King’s Ministers*, was, in our opinion, necessary for the due working of a Parliamentary Government; and, after a long struggle, it is now conceded to every political party which successively acquires the preponderance.

It appears that when Mr. Pitt was nearly twenty-one years old, he wished to become a candidate for the University of Cambridge, and applied to Lord Rockingham for his support, but that Lord Rockingham civilly declined to give it, ‘from

* Mr. Pitt, in his reply to Mr. Fox, 16th of December, 1788, (during the debates on the Regency) speaks of it as a fundamental principle held by Mr. Fox that the Ministers of the Crown were to be nominated by the prevailing party in Parliament.

'the knowledge he had of several persons who might be candidates.' Lord Stanhope remarks, that these persons 'were, no doubt, of the right family connexions—some nephews or some cousins of the great Whig houses.' (Vol. vii. p. 112.) But in 1780, Pitt was as much a Whig as Lord Rockingham, and he certainly was the son of a great Whig house.* Mr. Pitt's remarkable Parliamentary abilities would, under any circumstances, have been soon recognised; but his early confidence in his own powers, and the prompt recognition of his claims for leadership were due, in great measure, to his being the son of the great Lord Chatham.†

When Mr. Pitt entered public life, he certainly shared in the desire of the Whig party to diminish the influence of the Crown; and there is no doubt that the motion for Parliamentary Reform which he made in 1783, under the Coalition Ministry, and which he renewed in April 1785, when he was himself Prime Minister, had for its main object the reduction of the influence which the King exercised through the close boroughs. It appears that Mr. Pitt's plan (the whole of which was not dis-

* Compare Lord Stanhope's remarks with respect to the party divisions in the early part of the reign of George III.:—'The Whigs of 1763, no longer the Whigs of King William or Queen Anne, may be justly termed the founders of that distinguished party which bears their name at the present day. But they were split into sections, and it was between these sections, rather than between Whigs and Tories, that the battle for office raged. The Rockinghams and the Bedfords, Mr. Pitt and Mr. Grenville, all equally called themselves good Whigs, all would equally have declared that they never had been, that they never could be, Tories. Yet these were the chiefs of warring parties and of rival administrations.' (Vol. v. c. 44.) But although different sections of the Whigs might oppose one another, they all agreed in the principle that the King was to reign without governing. George III. on one occasion told the Duke of Portland (who had been the head of the Whig party after Lord Rockingham's death) that he was an 'old Whig.' 'In speaking of the King, the duke said, on the Wednesday, 18th of February [1801], before he was taken ill, his Majesty was quite himself, and talked to him most sensibly and judiciously on all subjects. *Said he was an old Whig*; that he considered those statesmen who made barrier treaties, and conducted the ten last years of the Succession war, the most able ones we ever had.' (*Lord Malmesbury's Diaries*, vol. iv. p. 44.)

† Mr. Pitt's power hung, throughout his life, upon the slender head of his elder brother's life. The second Lord Chatham, though married, had no child; his death would at any time have transferred Mr. Pitt to the House of Lords, and put an end to his career as leader of the House of Commons.

closed to Parliament) contemplated giving four members to the parishes of Marylebone and St. Pancras, and six members to Birmingham, Sheffield, Manchester, and Leeds.* Lord Stanhope truly remarks that, in the great division which turned out Lord North's government, and settled the question of American independence, in 1782, the county members generally voted with the Opposition; while the Ministerial forces were chiefly composed of borough members. Speaking of Lord North's party, he says,—

' Their numbers were now in great measure derived from merely nomination seats. Take, for example, the very stronghold of the smaller boroughs in that age. The two members for the county of Cornwall voted against Lord North; but of its borough representatives who took part in this division there were eight opponents, and no less than thirty supporters of the Government.' (Vol. vii. p. 206.)

The plan of Parliamentary Reform proposed by the Duke of Richmond in the House of Lords, on the 3rd of June, 1780, was democratic in its character; it was founded on the principles of universal suffrage, annual elections, and equal electoral districts, each returning one member.† Mr. Pitt's main object, however, was to emancipate Parliament from the influence of the Crown, exercised through the nomination boroughs, and to prevent the King bartering patronage for seats. He sought to diminish the influence of the Crown upon the House of Commons, not to clip the wings of the great proprietors of boroughs. One of his reasons for abandoning the question of Parliamentary Reform undoubtedly was, that he considered that object to have been attained by other means. When the question of Parliamentary Reform was revived by Lord John Russell, after the Peace, and the Reform Bill was brought forward by Lord Grey's Government, the object was changed; it had become anti-aristocratic instead of anti-monarchical. The influence of the Crown was no longer formidable; and the measure of 1831 was intended to diminish the power of the proprietors of close boroughs, by the same means which Pitt proposed to employ for diminishing the power of the Crown.

Lord John Russell examines the grounds for the supposition that the plan of the India Bill was prepared by Burke, and that it was adopted by Mr. Fox without adequate reflection. In rejecting this supposition, he makes the following, among other remarks:—

* Adolphus, History of England during the Reign of George III., vol. iv. p. 174.

† Adolphus, vol. iv. p. 145.

'If Mr. Fox formed his union with Lord North in the deliberate exercise of a sound judgment, surely we must give him credit for a similar deliberation when, in the recess of the summer and autumn, he constructed the measure upon which alone he feared any danger to the continuance of his power. Nor do the facts at all bear out the supposition that Mr. Fox was betrayed by the rashness of Mr. Burke into a scheme of which he did not approve. There do not appear any traces in the papers of Mr. Fox of any outline drawn up by Mr. Burke upon which the India Bill was framed, nor has any such plan been produced from the manuscripts of Mr. Burke. On the other hand, we know that the Bill was submitted to Lord North and Lord Loughborough, and probably to other members of the administration.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 98.)

Mr. Prior, likewise, in his *Life of Burke*, takes a view similar to that of Lord John:—

'The recess of Parliament was devoted to the concoction of the celebrated India Bill, of which Mr. Burke is said to have been a joint penman with the reputed author, though this has never been proved. It is certain, indeed, that he was the only one of the Ministry who knew much of the matter in progress previous to its coming before the public; and it is also certain that it was submitted to his revision; he might, likewise, have been the author of the second or supplementary Bill, ascertaining the powers of the new Government, and securing the rights and interests of the natives; but all the great and leading principles were undoubtedly those of Mr. Fox.' (c. 8. p. 275.)

Now in the correspondence of Burke, published in 1844 by Lord Fitzwilliam and Sir Richard Bourke, the following letter appears, addressed to Burke by Mr. Arthur Pigott, afterwards Sir Arthur Pigott, and Attorney-general in 1806:—

(Probably Oct. 1783.)

'Dear Sir,—I shall be particularly obliged to you to send me, as soon as ever you come in, so much of the Bill, or instructions of the bill, as you have, in the state in which it is, as it will very much forward my work. Indeed, I cannot begin till I get it, and therefore shall expect it impatiently. I would leave my servant to bring it if I had one with me.

'I am, dear Sir, ever yours,

'A. P.'

'Three o'clock.'

Note, in Mr. Burke's handwriting:—

'From Mr. Pigott, who finished the India Bill from my drafts.*'

* It is likewise stated in the life of Sir A. Pigott, in the '*Annual Obituary*,' that he assisted Burke in drawing the India Bill (vol. vi. p. 443.).

From this letter, and its indorsement, it is evident that the instructions for the India Bill were given to Mr. Pigott, the draftsman of the Bill, by Burke, and not by Fox; and, moreover, that Burke did not give his instructions in the form of heads, or notes, but that he prepared a draft of the Bill, which Pigott reduced into correct technical form. There is no reason to doubt that the plan was submitted to Fox, and maturely considered by him; but it may be regarded as certain that the conception and elaboration of it belong to Burke. Mr. Fox adopted it, and made it his own, so that he fully deserved the splendid panegyric upon his motives and intentions with which Burke concluded his speech on the Bill; but the ambitious plan, by which the power of the Company was at once annihilated, doubtless proceeded from the man who had devoted so much time to the investigation of Indian affairs, and who was, in a few years, to be the author of the great impeachment of Hastings, which, though barren of penal consequences, constituted an epoch in the management of Indian affairs.*

'The general election of 1784' (as Lord J. Russell remarks), 'determined for more than forty years the question of the Government of England.' The party, of which Pitt laid the foundation when he defeated the coalition of Fox and Lord North, continued, with the short interruption of the ministry of 1806, to govern the country until the year 1830. Of this period of forty-six years, not less than twenty-one were passed under the primacy of Mr. Pitt, whose long administration of

* The following account of the origin of the India Bill is given by Mr. Nicholls, in his '*Recollections of the Reign of George III.*;' his statement respecting Pigott is confirmed by the letter in the text:—

'When the Coalition came into power, Mr. Burke saw that much strength might be acquired for his party by the seizure of the Indian patronage. With this view Charles Fox was employed to bring in the India Bill, generally known by the name of Fox's India Bill. But I am firmly persuaded that Fox had nothing to do with the formation of this bill. It was proposed by Mr. Edmund Burke, whose only assistant in it was Mr. Pigott, afterwards Sir Arthur Pigott. Mr. Lee, at that time Attorney-general, and Sir James Mansfield, at that time Solicitor-general, both assured me that they never saw the bill until it was printed for the use of the House of Commons. They doubted whether Charles Fox himself had seen the bill before the essential parts of it had been completely arranged by Mr. Burke. Lord North certainly did not see it until the bill was completed, and when it was shown him he said, with his usual pleasantry and sagacity, that he thought it a good receipt to knock up an administration. But he supported it in the House of Commons.' (Vol. i. p. 55.)

eighteen years may be divided into two portions — that before and that after the French war. With respect to the first of these portions, Lord J. Russell makes the following remarks. After speaking of the India Bill, he says:—

‘The other public transactions which occurred between 1784 and 1793 are, chiefly, the financial system established by Mr. Pitt, the commercial treaty with France of 1786, the invasion of Holland in 1787, and the Regency question in 1788.

‘However unjustifiable may have been the conduct of Mr. Pitt in making himself the instrument of a court intrigue, candour must allow that his subsequent administration during peace was marked by large public views, was founded on grand principles, and led to happy results. The financial administration of Lord North had been a mere series of shifts and expedients to supply the wants of years of war and misfortune. And the losses of the empire, the old corrupt practices had flourished unchecked, if not increased, under that indolent and easy minister. Mr. Pitt, with a vigorous hand, pruned the luxuriance of prodigality, and grafted on the ancient system the new maxims he had learnt in the school of Adam Smith. A reduction of the tea duties checked smuggling, and increased consumption; a prudent economy enabled the minister to set apart a million a year as a sinking fund for the redemption of the national debt.’ (Vol. ii. p. 257.)

The conduct of Mr. Pitt, in first defending Warren Hastings and then assenting to his impeachment in the session of 1786-7, has often been the subject of comment. Mr. Adolphus examines the question at length, and enumerates the various discreditable motives which were at the time assigned for this step. Jealousy of the influence of Hastings at Court, fear of his appointment to the Presidency of the Board of Control, and a desire of diverting the attacks of opposition from himself to a State-criminal, were supposed to have actuated Mr. Pitt. Mr. Adolphus says that if it is necessary to ascribe his conduct to a motive of mere party politics, unconnected with the merits of the question, it may rather be conjectured that ‘he was pleased to see the members of opposition engaged in a conflict where success could gain for them no accession of influence or popularity, while failure would by many be deemed to inflict disgrace.’* Mr. Macaulay, in his Essay on the ‘Life of Hastings,’

* Vol. iv. p. 261-3. The following is the account in the ‘Annual Register,’ which was probably written by Burke himself:—‘The conduct of the minister on this occasion drew upon him much indecent calumny from the friends of Mr. Hastings; they did not hesitate to accuse him out of doors, both publicly and privately, of treachery. They declared it was in the full confidence of his protection and support that they had urged on Mr. Burke to bring

supposes Pitt to have been influenced by the fear that Hastings, created a peer, and placed at the Board of Control, would soon draw to himself the entire management of Eastern affairs, and might even become a formidable rival in the cabinet. Lord John Russell's remark is: 'Whether the Minister was convinced by the evidence which threw so full a light on the misdeeds of Warren Hastings, or whether he was glad to protect himself from *the ambition of a rival* by acceding to a prosecution against him, the effect was no less certain' (vol. ii. p. 255.); and he quotes the following passage from a letter of Lord Bulkeley to Lord Buckingham, in the Buckingham Papers, dated 27th April, 1789:—

'On one of the adjourned questions on Hastings's trial in the House of Lords, Lord Maitland, standing next to Dundas, asked him what he thought would be the result of the inquiry, to which he replied in these words: "I don't care what is done with him, *for you and your friends in opposition have done our business by keeping him out of the Board of Control.*" Lord Maitland on this called up Colonel Fitzpatrick and Dudley Long, in whose presence Dundas actually repeated his words, and they, of course, trumpeted them all over town; and they have occasioned much conversation and much abuse of Dundas, in addition to their former abuse on the part of Hastings's friends. The folly of such language, especially to these violent oppositionists, was very absurd, weak, and ill-judged; but the fact is certain.' (Vol. ii. p. 154.)

It should be observed that this letter was written in April, 1789, and that the conversation with Dundas reported in it was then recent, whereas the speech in which Mr. Pitt assented to the impeachment of Hastings was delivered on the 13th of June, 1786, nearly three years before. It is certain that Mr. Pitt could not have regarded Hastings as a rival, or have entertained any feeling of jealousy towards him, with respect to parliamentary contests. Pitt was now in the vigour of his powers, and he must have felt that a retired Indian governor, who entered the House of Commons for the first time in his fifty-third year, could not prove a very formidable antagonist or competitor in debate. An encounter of oratory between Pitt and Hastings would probably have been not very unlike the battle between Pyrrhus and Priam. It seems, moreover, that Hastings's ambition led him to desire a peerage, so that there was no question of his appearance in the House of Com-

'forward his charges, and that the gentleman accused had been persuaded to come to their bar, with an hasty and premature defence; and they did not scruple to attribute this conduct in the minister to motives of the basest jealousy.' (Vol. xxviii. p. 136.)

mons. Nor was it likely that Pitt should fear the influence of Hastings in the cabinet, in which parliamentary considerations would necessarily preponderate.* The only fear which Pitt could reasonably entertain was, that if Hastings, through the King's favour, should obtain a seat at the Board of Control, he might be able to distribute the valuable Indian patronage according to the King's personal views; whereas, in the hands of Dundas, it was used for the general purposes of the Government. This argument was doubtless presented to Pitt by Dundas, who probably had a stronger personal feeling against Hastings than Pitt himself. To this extent Pitt may have been jealous of Hastings; and to a danger of this description, the words of Dundas, reported by Lord Bulkeley, appear to allude. Mr. Pitt had probably no desire to throw the shield of ministerial protection over Hastings; at the same time, we cannot but think that one of his leading motives for the unexpected course which he took, was a reluctance to stop an impeachment supported by all the ability of Opposition, and relating to matters of which Englishmen in general had little or no knowledge, but of which some of Hastings's accusers were perfect masters. Mr. Nicholls, in his '*Recollections of the Reign of George III.*,' makes the following remark on the subject:—

'There were people who thought that Mr. Pitt had adopted this line of conduct to prevent the King from employing Mr. Hastings in India affairs. But I do not believe that Mr. Pitt was actuated by so personal and so paltry a motive. I think he consented to the impeachment, because he saw the control which he should obtain over the Opposition by such acquiescence, and his expectations were answered.'†

* Mr. Nicholls describes himself as having become acquainted with Hastings after the session in which the charges were brought against him by Burke:—'He appeared to me to be a man of a strong, vigorous, decisive mind, well acquainted with the character of the natives of India, and with the views and interests of its various princes. He seemed to me to be a man capable of extricating himself from difficulties by his great resources and dauntless courage. In one word, he came nearer to the idea which I had formed of an able statesman, than any other man with whom I ever had intercourse. But he was a statesman only for the affairs of India. He knew nothing of the various parties in England, their interests, their designs, their ability to effectuate those designs, or how far they were likely to be influenced or restrained by moral considerations. These were subjects on which he seemed to me never to have formed an opinion.'
(*Recollections*, vol. i. p. 277.)

† (Vol. i. p. 270.) Dean Pellew says, that the question of the abatement of the impeachment of Hastings, by dissolution of Parliament,

In December, 1785, the Prince of Wales being then in his twenty-fourth year*, Mr. Fox addressed to him a friendly letter, earnestly dissuading him from a marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert, chiefly on the ground of her being a Roman Catholic.† To this letter the Prince returned next day the following answer:—

‘ Carlton House, Dec. 11. 1785.

‘ Sunday Morning, 2 o’clock.

‘ My dear Charles,— Your letter of last night afforded me more true satisfaction than I can find words to express, as it is an additional proof to me, which I assure you I did not want, of your having that true regard and affection for me, which it is not only the wish but the ambition of my life to merit. Make yourself easy, my dear friend; believe me, the world will now soon be convinced that there not only is‡, but never was, any ground for these reports, which of late have been so malevolently circulated. I have not seen you since

‘ furnished the only occasion on which, as Lord Sidmouth believed, ‘ Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox were ever brought together in private life. ‘ They met at a consultation held in December, 1790, to consider, ‘ with reference to the trial of Mr. Hastings, whether an impeachment by the Commons abated by a dissolution of Parliament. ‘ Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox agreed in thinking that it did not; and ‘ nothing could exceed the ease and cordiality of their manner ‘ towards each other on that occasion.’ (*Life of Sidmouth*, vol. i. p. 80.) Lord Sidmouth was certainly mistaken. Mr. Pitt had an interview with Mr. Fox during the Shelburne administration; and he had a subsequent interview with him in 1792, to which we shall advert lower down.

* He was born on the 12th of August, 1762. He was thirteen years younger than Mr. Fox, who was born in 1749, and three years younger than Mr. Pitt, who was born in 1759. He survived them both twenty-four years.

† Mr. Fox was fully aware of the strength of the Prince’s feelings with respect to Mrs. Fitzherbert, from communications recently made to him, as we learn from Lord Holland’s account:—‘ Mrs. Fox, ‘ then Mrs. Armitstead, who was living at St. Anne’s, has repeatedly ‘ assured me that he [the Prince] came down thither more than once ‘ to converse with her and Mr. Fox on the subject; that he cried ‘ by the hour; that he testified the sincerity and violence of his ‘ passion and his despair by the most extravagant expressions and ‘ actions, rolling on the floor, striking his forehead, tearing his hair, ‘ falling into hysterics, and swearing that he would abandon the ‘ country, forego the Crown, sell his jewels and plate, and scrape ‘ together a competence to fly with the object of his affections to ‘ America.’ (*Memoirs of Whig Party*, vol. ii. p. 126. Compare *Adolphus*, vol. iv. p. 217.)

‡ The Prince means to say, ‘ not only is not.’

the apostacy of Eden.* I think it ought to have the same effect upon all our friends that it has upon me; I mean the linking us closer to each other; and I believe that you will easily believe these to be my sentiments, for you are perfectly acquainted with my ways of thinking upon these sort of subjects. When I say, my ways of thinking, I think I had better say, my old maxim, which I ever intend to adhere to; I mean that of swimming or sinking with my friends. I have not time to add much more, except just to say, that I believe I shall meet you at dinner at Bushy on Tuesday, and to desire you to believe me at all times,

‘My dear Charles,

‘Most affectionately yours,

‘GEORGE P.’

(*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 283.)†

This false, hypocritical, and canting letter was written on the 11th of December. On the 21st of the same month the Prince of Wales was privately married to Mrs. Fitzherbert, by a clergyman of the Church of England, in the manner prescribed by the Common Prayerbook, and the certificate was attested by two witnesses. It is in the highest degree improbable that the final resolution for this step should not have been taken, and the preparations for it made, on the day on which he assured Mr. Fox that the rumours respecting his intended marriage were wholly unfounded. The subject, however, is evidently embarrassing and painful to the Prince: for after having denied the truth of the reports to which Mr. Fox's letter referred, he escapes with great agility to the comparatively uninteresting subject of Mr. Eden's apostacy, and to protestations of his immutable fidelity to the Whigs, on which subjects Mr.

* Mr. Eden, afterwards created Lord Auckland, seceded from the Whigs, and joined Mr. Pitt at this time. He was appointed a member of the Board of Trade, and Minister Plenipotentiary to negotiate the Commercial Treaty with France, on December 9. 1785 (*London Gazette*). ‘Mr Eden's nomination as negotiator occasioned some personal attacks. He had been the firm friend of the Opposition, and styled the father of the Coalition; by them he had been created a privy councillor, and appointed one of the joint vice-treasurers of Ireland; and he was now remarked to be the first who had seceded from that phalanx.’ (*Adolphus*, vol. iv. p. 203.)—His removal from the Opposition to the Treasury bench was the subject of animadversion in the debate on the Address, Jan. 24. 1786: Lord Surrey pretended not to see him, and regretted that he was not in his place. He had previously held office under Lord North's Government.

† The letter of Mr. Fox to the Prince and the Prince's answer are likewise printed in ‘Lord Holland's Memoirs of the Whig Party,’ vol. ii. pp. 127–37. Lord J. Russell has omitted two paragraphs in Mr. Fox's letter, which are printed in ‘Lord Holland's Memoirs.’

Fox's long and argumentative letter did not contain a single word.

The exact truth respecting this marriage was carefully concealed, not only from the public, but from the most intimate friends of the Prince.* But rumours of it were soon in circulation, and an allusion to it was made in the House of Commons. In a subsequent debate, Mr. Fox took occasion to treat the report alluded to as a vile calumny; he 'denied it in toto, in point of fact, as well as law. The fact not only never could have happened legally, but never did happen in any way whatsoever, and had from the beginning been a base and malicious falsehood.' On being further questioned, Mr. Fox declared that 'he had direct authority for what he had said.' (April 30th, 1787.)†

After this nuptial ceremony, wholly invalid in law, had been performed, the Prince had not the courage to avow that he had even gone through the forms of a marriage with a Catholic. He therefore authorised and instructed Mr. Fox to deny the marriage, not merely as to its legal validity, but as to its actual solemnisation, in his place in Parliament. That this authority was distinctly given is certain; for if Mr. Fox had spoken without authority, the Prince would unquestionably, either in public or in private, have disavowed his act, which he never did, except to one person. This person was Mrs. Fitzherbert. He appears to have assured her that Mr. Fox had made the statement without his authority; and her resentment against Mr. Fox for the supposed wrong was in consequence permanent. The unprincipled step which the Prince had taken (for he never intended

* It is stated by Lord Holland, 'Memoirs of the Whig Party,' vol. ii. p. 124., that documents proving the marriage, after having been long in the possession of Mrs. Fitzherbert's family, were deposited in June, 1833, at Coutts' bank, in a sealed box, by agreement between the Duke of Wellington and Sir W. Knighton, as the executors of George IV., and Lord Albemarle and Lord Stourton, as the nominees of Mrs. Fitzherbert. Lord Brougham states that of Mrs. Fitzherbert's papers, 'one was a will, leaving everything to her disposal; another was a marriage-settlement of great length, with the certificate of the marriage annexed.' (*Sketches of Statesmen*, vol. ii. p. 2.)

† Adolphus mentions a belief that shortly after this debate Mr. Fox had an interview with the King (vol. iv. p. 222.). No allusion to such an occurrence occurs in the 'Memorials of Fox,' or in Lord Holland's work; and it seems in the highest degree improbable that the King should have communicated with Mr. Fox on the subject of the Prince's marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert, at this or any other time.

the marriage to be binding*) placed him in a painful alternative, as soon as the rumours respecting it began to attract attention. He must either incur the public indignation by avowing his secret marriage with a Catholic, or he must deny a fact in the truth of which Mrs. Fitzherbert was deeply interested. In this difficulty the course which he took was to authorise Mr. Fox to give it a solemn denial in the House of Commons, and afterwards to assure Mrs. Fitzherbert that Mr. Fox had denied it without his authority. The duplicity of which he was guilty, both to his alleged friend and his alleged wife, did not, however, sit easy on his conscience, as appears from the following account by Lord Grey, of an interview which he had with the Prince on the day on which Fox made his declaration in the House.

‘In a long conversation which I had with him, in which he was dreadfully agitated, the object was to get me to say something in Parliament for the satisfaction of Mrs. Fitzherbert, which might take off the effect of Fox’s declaration. I expressly told him how prejudicial a continuance of the discussion must be to him, and positively refused to do what he desired. He put an end to the conversation abruptly by saying, “Well, if nobody else will, Sheridan must.” (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 288.)

Lord Grey adds, that at this interview the Prince confessed to him that the marriage had taken place. It is difficult to conceive a more humiliating and more dishonourable position than that in which the Prince now stood: denying his marriage to Fox, confessing it to Grey, and denying his denial to Mrs. Fitzherbert; treating it as a fiction to the first, as a nullity to the second, and as a reality to the third.

An account of the Prince’s conduct on this occasion, and of his interview with Lord Grey, similar to that contained in the Memorials of Fox, is given by Lord Holland in his ‘*Memoirs of the Whig Party*,’ who adds the following particulars:—

‘Mr. Sheridan did come down to the House and utter some unintelligible sentimental trash about female delicacy—which implied the displeasure of the Prince, and still more of Mrs. Fitzherbert, at

* Mr. Fox, in his letter to the Prince before the marriage, spoke out so plainly as to leave no doubt on this subject:—‘In the mean-while,’ he says, ‘a mock marriage (*for it can be no other*) is neither honourable for any of the parties, nor, with respect to your Royal highness, even safe. This appears so clear to me, that, if I were Mrs. Fitzherbert’s father or brother, I would advise her not by any means to agree to it, and to prefer any other species of connection with you to one leading to so much misery and mischief.’ (*Memoirs of Whig Party*, vol. ii. p. 134.)

what had passed in Parliament,—but did not directly or even remotely insinuate that what Mr. Fox had spoken was either beyond or without the authority of the Prince of Wales. That Mr. Fox subsequently suspected, or rather knew, that some ceremony had taken place, I cannot doubt; but, never having spoken to him on the subject, I cannot assert it of my own knowledge. The exact date and circumstances of that ceremony have not come to my knowledge; but the account given of some part of the transaction by Mrs. Fitzherbert herself to a friend of mine, a man of strict veracity, is curious, and, I believe, correct. It was at the Prince's own earnest and repeated solicitations, not at Mrs. Fitzherbert's request, that any ceremony was resorted to. She knew it to be invalid in law; she thought it nonsense, and told the Prince so. In proof that such had been her uniform opinion, she adduced a very striking circumstance,—namely, that no ceremony by a Roman Catholic priest took place at all,—the most obvious method of allaying her scruples, had she had any. I believe, therefore, she spoke with truth, when she frankly owned “that she had given herself up to him, exacted no conditions, trusted “to his honour, and set no value on the ceremony which he insisted “on having solemnised.” It was performed by an English clergyman. A certificate was signed by him, and attested by two witnesses, both, I believe, Catholic gentlemen, and one a near relation of Mrs. Fitzherbert,—Mr. Errington. Mrs. Fitzherbert, from mixed feelings of fear and generosity, tore off the names of the witnesses at some subsequent period, lest they should by possibility be involved in any legal penalties for being present at an illegal transaction. Before George IV.'s accession to the throne, or, as I believe, his appointment to the Regency, the clergyman was dead (for it was not, as often surmised, Parson Johnes who married them), and his name, I understand, remains annexed to the instrument purporting to be a register or certificate of the ceremony. If any corroboration were necessary to substantiate facts of which such proofs are extant, and to which there are so many unexceptionable testimonies, it would be found in the behaviour of Mrs. Fitzherbert on many subsequent occasions, and in the uniform respect and attention which she has received from nearly all the branches of the Royal family.’ (Vol. ii. p. 140-2.)

This account so far exonerates the Prince, that it shows Mrs. Fitzherbert to have been aware of the utter worthlessness of the ceremony which she went through for effecting a valid marriage. At the same time, as the Prince desired it, he must have intended it to afford her some satisfaction; and she probably thought that it would in some way bind his conscience, and that he would take some ulterior step, instead of treating it with the entire disregard which he afterwards evinced for this self-imposed obligation.

‘The mental disorder which in 1788 afflicted the King (says Lord J. Russell), gave rise to a singular and deplorable contest.

' Mr. Pitt, as the guardian of the rights of the Crown, Mr. Fox, as the champion of the rights of the people, the Prince of Wales, as a dutiful son, the Queen, as an affectionate mother, seem all to have deserted their proper posts, and given but too much reason for censure.' The nature of the controversy between Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox respecting the appointment and powers of a Regent is so well known, that it need not be here repeated: Lord John thinks that a Regent with all the powers of a King ought, in the first instance, to have been appointed; and that such restrictions as were reasonable ought to have been subsequently imposed on him by Act of Parliament, to which his own assent would have been given.

A full and authentic account of the events of this period is contained in the series of almost daily letters from Lord Grenville to his brother, the Marquis of Buckingham, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, which is printed in the 'Buckingham Papers.' Lord Grenville, then Mr. William Grenville, held one of the offices of joint paymaster, and was in confidential communication with Mr. Pitt during the course of the King's illness and the arrangement of the measure for a Regency. His letters disclose all the views and feelings of the Government at this period. The 'Memorials of Fox' afford little information respecting the counsels of Opposition during the King's illness; but they contain some interesting documents drawn up by the leading Whigs for the vindication of the Prince and the Duke of York, after the King's recovery.

Lord Grenville first mentions the King's illness in a letter of the 23rd of October, 1788, as having begun in a violent spasmodic attack of the stomach, brought on by his remaining a whole day in wet stockings. The King subsequently appeared at a levee*; but his health became worse, and his recovery was spoken of as doubtful. The political effects of the accession of the Prince of Wales became an immediate subject of speculation. 'You may naturally conceive (says Lord Grenville on Nov. 5.) the exultation, not even wearing the appearance of disguise, which there is in one party, and the depression of

* 'Just as the King was taken ill in 1788, he said, after the last levee he held in the closet, to Lord Thurlow and the Duke of Leeds, on the first advising him to take care of himself and return to Windsor, "You, then, my Lord Thurlow, forsake me, and suppose me ill beyond recovery; but, whatever you and Mr. Pitt may think or feel, I that am born a gentleman, shall never lay my head on my last pillow in peace and quiet, as long as I remember the loss of my American colonies." I had this fact from the Duke of Leeds, who was present.' (*Lord Malmesbury's Diaries*, vol. iv. p. 19.)

'those who belong to the other.* At this time the King is described as being in imminent danger†; his mental alienation, and its possible permanence if the bodily health should be restored, are also for the first time mentioned. Lord Grenville speculates on the course which Fox and his friends will take if the Prince should become either King or Regent. His own opinion is (Nov. 7.), that the whole of Mr. Pitt's Ministry will be at once turned out; but he describes the general feeling as being, that the Prince will negotiate with Mr. Pitt, from the fear of his popularity; in which case it is thought, that he ought not to decline all negotiation, but that he would be justified in refusing to accept any other than his actual office of Prime Minister. The King's bodily health now improved, but the mental alienation continued. This state pointed clearly to the necessity of constituting a regency during the incapacity of the Crown, a contingency for which the Constitution makes no provision. Lord Grenville's letter of November 13th contains a full statement of the views of the Government with respect to this subject. It announces Pitt's intention to introduce a Bill appointing the Prince of Wales Regent, with certain restrictions; and it sets forth his own views of the course to be taken in case a proposal should be made to Pitt for the formation of a Coalition Government with Fox. Lord Grenville thinks that the most desirable thing would be, that Pitt should be at once removed; he believes that the difficulties of a real *bonâ fide* junction are insuperable, and that no such junction is in fact contemplated. He is convinced that their proposals, if any are made, will have no other object than that of satisfying the Prince, and of lessening the odium of Pitt's removal in the eyes of the public, and holding him out as a haughty and impracticable character.

* 'I returned to London from Bath a day or two previous to the commencement of the session. The capital exhibited a scene of fermentation difficult to conceive or to depict. Yet was it far exceeded during the last days of January, 1793, on Louis XVI.'s decapitation.' (*Wrazall's Posthumous Memoirs*, vol. iii. p. 178.)

† 'The King was worse. His night had been very bad; all the fair promise of amendment was shaken; he had now some symptoms even dangerous to his life. O, good heaven! what a day did this prove! I saw not a human face, save at dinner; and then, what faces! gloom and despair in all, and silence to every species of intelligence.' (*Madame D'Arblay's Diary*, Nov. 16. 1788.) Tomline, on visiting Mr. Pitt at this time found him in hourly expectation of receiving intelligence of the King's death. (*Life of Pitt*, vol. ii. p. 363. 8vo.)

Pitt's popularity was (he says) never greater than at this moment; and he thinks that if the Prince should be so ill-advised as to dismiss him, the current would run at least as strongly in Pitt's favour as it did in favour of the King in 1784. A few days later Lord Grenville says that the language of the Opposition points to a coalition, but that the Prince's manner to Pitt shows that no such intention is entertained. Sir W. Young, a supporter of the Administration, writes to Lord Buckingham, in a similar tone, on the 25th of November.

'Should the change of Ministry (too much apprehended) take place, it is thought that Fox's party—to temporise with the public opinion, too strong to meet in the teeth—will propose a coalescence of some sort; but so narrowed, and in regard to Mr. Pitt, moreover, placing him in such jar of official situation, that it cannot be in any manner listened to. The refusal of the insidious offer is then to be noised through the country, and a trial to be made to engage the people "to join with those who proffered a sacrifice of enmities to Pitt for the "public good." My opinion is, that the trial will be abortive, and the present Administration retire (if so necessitated) merely to return to power on the shoulders of the nation.' (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. ii. p. 17.)

The belief in a coalition was not of long duration. Mr. Pitt and his friends soon became aware that whenever the Prince of Wales was constituted Regent, he would dismiss the existing Ministers, and form a Foxite Administration. That the intentions of the Opposition were not misunderstood is plain from the following passage in a confidential letter of Mr. Fox dated the 15th of December:—

'We shall have several hard fights in the House of Commons this week and next, in some of which I fear we shall be beat; but whether we are or not, *I think it certain that in about a fortnight we shall come in.* If we carry our questions, we shall come in a more creditable and triumphant way; but at any rate the Prince must be Regent, and of consequence the Ministry must be changed. The manner in which the Prince has behaved through the whole has been the most steady, the most friendly, and the handsomest that can be conceived. You know when he sets his mind to a thing he can do it well; and in this instance he has done it most thoroughly. The Duke of York, who is steadiness itself, has undoubtedly contributed to help him to his good resolutions, and seems as warmly our friend as the Prince himself. In short, with regard to Princes, everything is easy and pleasant, much beyond what I could form any idea of. In regard to other things, I am rather afraid they will get some cry against the Prince for grasping, as they call it, at too much power; but I am sure I cannot in conscience advise him to give up anything that is really necessary to his Government; or, indeed, to claim anything else as Regent but the full power of a king, to which he is

entitled. The King himself (notwithstanding the reports which you may possibly hear) is certainly worse, and perfectly mad. I believe the chance of his recovery is very small indeed; but I do not think there is any probability of his dying.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 299.)

On the 17th of December, when the King's symptoms had undergone a material improvement, and his speedy recovery began to be anticipated by some of the physicians, Lord Grenville writes to his brother as follows:—

'It will be ridiculous if he should recover just in time to give the royal dissent to the Regency Bill; which is not impossible. The more probable supposition is, that they will just have time to parcel out the spoils, to dismiss us, and to hold their offices about a month; and so will end (if this should happen) the third reign of King 'Charles III.*

In a subsequent letter of the 19th of February, when the King's convalescence was declared by the doctors, and the Ministers had decided to communicate to him the steps taken respecting a Regency, Lord Grenville expresses himself thus:—

'If the experiment succeeds, you need not be told that we shall not feel ourselves disposed, nor indeed at liberty, to give up the King's authority (he being well) into the hands of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales; and the less so, because we know that he and his friends, as he calls them, have taken the resolution of making the change at all events, and of taking all the offices of the country into their own hands, even (as they express themselves) if they are to hold them only twelve hours.' (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. ii. p. 116.)

A report was circulated by the Prince's friends that he would refuse to accept the Regency unless it were wholly unfettered by restrictions†; but Lord Grenville doubts whether this intention was ever really entertained (letters of the 7th and 9th of December); and at all events it was subsequently abandoned. The first person consulted by the Prince of Wales, when he became aware of the King's malady, was Lord Loughborough; Mr. Fox was then in Italy, and he did not return till the deliberations of the Prince's advisers had made some progress. Lord Loughborough (as we learn from the documents published

* By the two previous reigns of Mr. Fox, Lord Grenville means the Rockingham Ministry and the Coalition Ministry in 1782 and 1783.

† The Prince, on the receipt of the letter from Mr. Pitt proposing the restrictions, wrote a letter to Lord Loughborough, in which he calls them 'such restrictions as no dictator could possibly ever have been barefaced enough to have brought forward.' (*Lord Campbell's Lives of the Chancellors*, vol. vi. p. 210.)

by Lord Campbell, in his 'Lives of the Chancellors') advised that the Prince should at once assume the entire regal power; that he should, of his own authority, call a meeting of the Privy Council, and take the necessary steps for convening Parliament.* A declaration, to be read by the Prince to the Privy Council upon this occasion, is preserved among Lord Loughborough's papers. As soon as Mr. Fox returned he condemned this plan; but he so far adopted Lord Loughborough's views, as to assent to the doctrine that the Prince of Wales had a right to exercise the royal functions during the incapacity of the King. Lord Campbell and Lord Brougham† think, that if Lord Loughborough's plan had been acted on, and if a *coup d'état*, such as he recommended, had been attempted, a civil war would have been the result. It appears to us, however, that the opposition of the Executive Government, backed by the opinion of Parliament, would have frustrated the plan at its outset. The Prince's summons to the Council would have been disobeyed, or would have been obeyed only by his personal friends; and the attempt would have proved a failure.

The Prince and the Duke of York openly canvassed for votes in the House of Commons against the Regency Bill of the Administration. 'Lord Lonsdale's people (says Lord Grenville, 'December 17th) were against us in consequence of a letter, 'written by the Prince of Wales himself, soliciting it as a 'personal favour. This, which I have from authority, may 'serve to give you an idea of the pains they had taken.' There can be no doubt that the Prince was privy to the claim of *right* which was made on his behalf by Fox, and that he fully approved of the claim being made. The feeling of Parliament

* The following passage occurs in the Prince's Memorial to the King, delivered to him after his recovery:—'I was urged, from an 'honourable opinion, I am sure, and one which was sincerely entertained by the person to whom I allude, to come forward much 'earlier in my own person to claim the Government, as falling to 'me of right during your Majesty's illness, and to take the lead out 'of the hands of your Majesty's Ministers into my own. Such was 'the opinion of my uncle, the Duke of Gloucester; and he pressed 'it on me with all the earnestness of a sincere and fixed opinion on 'a subject of such moment.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 319.) 'The Duke of Gloucester here alluded to was the third son of Frederic Prince of Wales, who married the Countess Dowager of Waldegrave. His son, Prince William, afterwards Duke of Gloucester, married the Princess Mary, now Duchess of Gloucester, the fourth daughter and only surviving child of King George the Third.

† See Lord Brougham's 'Historical Sketches of Statesmen,' vol. i. p. 178. (ed. 1855).

did not support this pretension; and Pitt took instant advantage of the error committed by his adversary, exclaiming, as is well known, that 'he would unwhig the gentleman for the rest of 'his life.'* The following remarks of Lord Grenville, in a letter of December 13th, illustrate the manner in which this question was viewed by the House of Commons:—

'I must refer you to the papers for an account of our triumphant day in the House of Commons yesterday. You will see by that, that I was not mistaken in my opinion that the doctrine of the Prince's right was not likely to be a very popular one. Fox found that by what he said before he had offended so many people, that he was obliged to take the very first moment of explaining it away; still, however, he has left it in such a shape, that we cannot fail of debating it with great advantage. He intends, as you will see by his speech, to move the previous question on Pitt's proposition, which he is afraid to attempt to negative. After this recantation was over, the day was closed by such a blunder of Sheridan's as I never knew any man of the meanest talents guilty of before. During the whole time that I have sat in Parliament, in pretty warm times, I never remember such an uproar as was raised by his threatening us "*with the danger of provoking the Prince to assert his right*," which were the exact words which he used.'† (Vol. ii. p. 56.)

Again, in a letter of December 17th he says, 'Fox's declaration of the Prince of Wales's right has been of no small service to us. Is it not wonderful that such great talents should be conducted with so little judgment?'‡ This celebrated difference between Pitt and Fox respecting the Prince's

* This debate is well described in Wraxall's 'Posthumous Memoirs,' vol. iii. p. 201-7.

† Concerning this indiscretion see Moore's 'Life of Sheridan,' chap. xiii., where the Regency question of 1788 is treated with judgment and impartiality.

‡ Wraxall has the following remark in his 'Posthumous Memoirs,' vol. iii. p. 224. :—'I cannot indeed too strongly repeat, that in mental endowments of every kind Fox equalled, if not exceeded, his antagonist. It was Pitt's superior judgment and correct life which principally turned in his favour the scale, which retained him in office throughout almost his whole career, while the want of those qualities excluded Fox from office.'

Lord Brougham tells an anecdote, that 'when the conversation once rolled upon the quality most required in a Prime Minister, and one said eloquence, another knowledge, a third toil, Mr. Pitt said, "No; patience."' (Sketches of Statesmen, vol. i. p. 278.) We rejoice to observe that Lord Brougham has reprinted, with additions, his valuable sketches of the statesmen of the reign of George III. Many of them relate to contemporaries, who were his friends or his antagonists; and to events, *quorum pars magna fuit*.

right to the Regency, will be found, upon examination, to be little more than verbal. When during the American War the *right* of taxing the colonies was so often insisted on by Lord North and his supporters, Burke argued, with true wisdom, that it was vain to talk about an abstract right; the question was, whether it was politic and expedient to exercise and enforce that right. By *right* in these discussions was meant a *legal power*. When, however, Fox spoke of the Prince's right to the Regency, he meant, not a legal power (the existence of which nobody thought of asserting), but a strong and overwhelming *moral claim*.* That the Prince of Wales possessed such a moral claim Mr. Pitt did not dispute; nor did he ever entertain an idea either of conferring the Regency upon any other person, or of associating the Prince with a Council. The real question at issue between Fox and Pitt on this occasion was, not as to the choice of the Regent, about which they were agreed, but as to the imposition of restrictions. Pitt proposed certain limitations to the Regent's power, whereas Fox maintained that he ought to possess all the regal powers and prerogatives undiminished.

When the Prince of Wales was appointed Regent in 1811, the precedent of 1788 was followed; and the Opposition did not maintain the principle that the Prince of Wales, as heir-apparent, succeeded of course to the Regency during the King's incapacity. Mr. W. Lambe, however (afterwards Lord Melbourne), upon the resolution that 'the Regent should be laid under certain restrictions,' moved an amendment, 'that the entire royal power should be conferred upon him without any restrictions.' This amendment was negatived by a majority of only 224 to 200 votes.†

* 'It is in this sense we understand the argument maintained in 1788, for the right of the Prince of Wales to the Regency, subject to the adjudication of the two Houses of Parliament. Strict legal right, which could be asserted and made good in a court of judicature, he certainly had none. It was observed, with more truth than decorum, by Mr. Pitt, that every individual of his father's subjects had as good a legal right to the Regency as his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales.' (*Ed. Rev.* vol. xviii. p. 61. By Mr. Allen.)

† See also the debate on Sir F. Burdett's motion for a Regency Bill, in the House of Commons, February 23rd, 1813; and the speech of Mr. W. Wynne, 6th July, 1830. Lord Brougham, 'Sketches of State-man,' vol. i. p. 176., remarks that the two precedents of 1788 and 1811 'have now settled the constitutional law and practice in this important particular.' Mr. Addington had intended to follow the precedent of 1788 in February, 1801, when the King was

When the King's illness was at its beginning, and the dismissal of Pitt seemed imminent, Lord Thurlow, who had held the Great Seal, with the sole exception of the nine months of the Coalition Ministry, since 1778*, entered into a negotiation with the Prince, in order to make terms with him for retaining his high office in the new Administration. His position at this critical moment is thus described by Lord Grenville, in a letter of November, 30th : —

' You will have heard, in all probability, much on the subject of the Chancellor. His situation is a singular one. It is unquestionably true that he has seen Fox, and I believe that he has also seen Sheridan repeatedly †, and certainly the Prince of Wales. And of all these conversations he has never communicated one word to any other member of the Cabinet. Yet I am persuaded that he has as yet made no terms with them, and that whenever they come to that point they will differ. With this clue, however, you will be at no loss to guess where the Prince acquires his knowledge of the plans of Regency which are to be proposed, because, even supposing the Chancellor not to have directly betrayed the individual opinions of his colleagues, yet still his conversation upon these points, in all of which he has explicitly agreed with the opinions of Pitt, must lead to the communication of the plans in agitation. . . . Pitt has been induced, from his regard to the King, to dissemble his knowledge of

threatened with a return of insanity. (*Pellew's Life of Lord Sidmouth*, vol. i. p. 347.)

* Lord Thurlow was first appointed to the office of Lord Chancellor in June, 1778, in Lord North's administration. He continued to hold the office in the subsequent administrations of Lord Rockingham and Lord Shelburne. During the Coalition Ministry, from April to December, 1783, the Great Seal was in commission. In December, 1783, Lord Thurlow resumed the Great Seal in Mr. Pitt's Ministry, and retained it till January, 1793, when Mr. Pitt insisted on his dismissal. — See 'Buckingham Papers,' vol. ii. p. 207-8., and 'Lord Campbell's Life.'

† Much information respecting Sheridan's negotiations with Thurlow will be found in Moore's 'Life of Sheridan,' chap. xiii. See also 'Lord Campbell's Life.' Lord Campbell seems to be mistaken in supposing that Thurlow's treachery to his colleagues was revealed to them by the well-known incident of the *hat* (vol. v. p. 586.). Several versions of this story are given by Lord Campbell. The story (as we have heard it on authority which we believe to be conclusive), is that when the Cabinet held at Windsor was over, the Chancellor's carriage was called first, and a search was made for his hat, but it could not be found in the room where the Cabinet had sat. Thurlow hereupon growled out, 'Then I suppose I have left it in the other place;' the other place being the Prince's apartment. In Lord Campbell's 'Lives,' ib. p. 583., 'Capt. Rayne' is twice misprinted for 'Capt. Payne.'

Thurlow's conduct, and to suppress the resentment which it so naturally excites. . . . There is no great inconvenience arising, in reality, from the communication of these intentions to the Prince. His intentions are sufficiently decided, and he has no means of traversing our schemes.'

The anticipations expressed in this letter with respect to Lord Thurlow proved true. Lord Thurlow made some bargain with the Prince through the mediation of Sheridan; but the arrangement was disapproved by Fox when he returned from the Continent, and advantage was taken of a change of intention on the part of Thurlow to annul the treaty.* His colleagues were so fully impressed with a belief in his apostacy, that Pitt went to the House of Lords to hear his declaration in favour of the Prince; when Thurlow made a solemn appeal to the Almighty in witness of his fidelity to his King, Pitt, struck with the effrontery and falsehood of this theatrical display, allowed the exclamation, 'O the rascal!' to escape from his lips as he stood under the throne.†

The violence of Burke during the Regency debates is known to have produced a most unfavourable impression, both upon his hearers and the public. Moore even supposes that the displeasure caused by his indiscretion during this transaction assisted in producing the subsequent alienation between him and Fox, and first opened the breach which the French Revolution widened and rendered permanent. Be this as it may be, it surprises us who know Burke mainly from his speeches and pamphlets, to find a respectable member of Parliament writing, from the House of Commons, the following account of one of his great exhibitions on the Regency question:—

'Edmund Burke arose a little after four, and is speaking yet (half past five). He has been wilder than ever, and laid himself and party more open than ever speaker did. He is Folly personified, but shaking his cap and bells under the laurel of genius.' 'In speaking of our debate I had forgot Burke, who, after I finished my last night's letter, finished his wild speech in a manner next to madness. He let

* The letter of Mr. Fox to Lord Loughborough, of 26th December, 1788, in 'Lord Campbell's Chancellors,' vol. vi. p. 206., proves that Thurlow voluntarily broke off the negotiation with the Prince. Mr. Pitt believed at the time that the negotiation was broken off in consequence of the claim to the Great Seal made by Lord Loughborough. 'Wraxall's Posth. Mem.,' vol. iii. p. 218. On the Prince's negotiation with Thurlow, see 'Gifford's Life of Pitt,' vol. i. p. 386. 4to.

† This story is told by Wraxall, *ib.* p. 220., on the authority of General Manners, who heard Pitt's exclamation, and afterwards obtained from him an explanation of it.

out two of the new titles; Fitzwilliam to be Marquis of Rockingham, and Lord G. Cavendish . . . * His party pulled him, and our friends calling "Hear, hear," we lost the rest of the twenty-five new peers, who would all have come out.' (*Sir William Young to the Marquis of Buckingham, 22nd and 23rd December, 1788, vol. ii. p. 71. 73.*)

The distribution of offices believed at the time to have been agreed upon was — First Lord of the Treasury, Duke of Portland; First Commissioner of the Great Seal, Lord Loughborough; Privy Seal, Lord Carlisle; Home Secretary or President of the Council, Lord Stormont; Foreign Secretary, Mr. Fox; Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord John Cavendish; and First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Fitzwilliam. Burke and Sheridan were to be Paymaster and Treasurer of the Navy.† Of these, Lord Stormont and Lord Carlisle had been adherents of Lord North; the others belonged to the party of Mr. Fox. Lord Grenville adds that the Duke of York was to be Commander-in-chief, and the Prince himself, the Dukes of York and Gloucester, and General Conway to be Field Marshals.‡ So certain, indeed, did the accession of the Prince of Wales to the Regency appear in the early part of February, 1789, that medals, with his portrait, and suitable inscriptions, commemorating his appointment as Regent, were struck and sold at the time.§

The King's convalescence was announced to the House of Lords, by the Lord Chancellor, on February 24.; that his restoration from his mental malady was for the time complete, appears from the following passage in a letter of Lord Grenville, written on that day: —

'Pitt has just shown me a letter which he received last night from the King, written in his Majesty's own hand, couched in the warmest terms, thanking him for his unshaken attachment to his interests, and desiring to see him this morning. He went accordingly to Kew, and was with the King above an hour. He says, that there was not the smallest trace or appearance of any disorder, that the King's manner was unusually composed and dignified, but that there was no other difference whatever from what he had been used to see. The King spoke of his disorder as of a thing past, and which had left no other impression on his mind than that of gratitude for his recovery,

* The title intended for Lord George Cavendish is misprinted in the original, and unintelligible. We have stated in a former Number that the two first volumes of this publication were edited by an incompetent person.

† Adolphus, vol. iv. p. 393.

‡ Buckingham Papers, vol. ii. p. 104.

§ Wrexall's Posth. Mem., vol. iii. p. 310.

and a sense of what he owed to those who had stood by him. He spoke of these in such a manner as brought tears into his eyes, but even with that degree of affection of mind there was not the least appearance of disorder.' (Vol. ii. p. 125.)

That the popular feeling was strongly enlisted in favour of the King's recovery appears from an entry in the diary of Miss Burney, who was at this time attached to the person of the Queen, and an inmate of Windsor Castle. She describes a visit of Sir Lucas Pepys*, who informed her of the wish of the physicians to remove the King from Windsor to Kew. (28th November, 1788.)

'The difficulty how to get the King away from his favourite abode was all that rested. If they even attempted force, they had not a doubt but his smallest resistance would call up the whole country to his fancied rescue. Yet how, at such a time, prevail by persuasion? He moved me even to tears, by telling me that none of their own lives would be safe if the King did not recover, so prodigiously high ran the tide of affection and loyalty. All the physicians received threatening letters daily, to answer for the safety of their monarch with their lives. Sir George Baker† had already been stopped in his carriage by the mob, to give an account of the King; and when he said it was a bad one, they had furiously exclaimed, "The more shame for you."' (*Madame Darblay's Diary*, vol. iv. p. 282.)

The King's recovery was celebrated by a spontaneous illumination, which Wraxall calls the most universal exhibition of national loyalty and joy ever witnessed in England. 'London displayed a blaze of light from one extremity to the other; the illuminations extending, without any metaphor, from Hampstead and Highgate to Clapham, and even as far as Tooting; while the vast distance between Greenwich and Kensington presented the same dazzling appearance. The poorest mechanics contributed their proportion, and instances

* Sir Lucas Pepys, Bart., M. D., was younger brother of Sir William Pepys, Bart., the father of the late Earl of Cottenham.

† Physician to the King and Queen, and afterwards President of the College of Physicians. He was born in 1722, and died in 1809. Dr. Johnson, in arguing against Dr. Taylor, a Whig, in 1777, asserted, that 'if England were fairly polled, the present King would be sent away to-night, and his adherents hanged to-morrow.' Dr. Taylor denied what Johnson said, and maintained, 'that there was an abhorrence against the Stuart family, though he admitted that the people were not much attached to the present King.' (*Boswell's Johnson*, ann. 1777.) A great change in the popular feeling towards the King had taken place in the eleven years from 1777 to 1788.

'were exhibited of cobbler's stalls decorated with one or two 'farthing candles.'*

The prevalence of this strong feeling produced the greater displeasure at the conduct of the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York, who showed a striking want of filial duty, and behaved with remarkable indecorum and impropriety on this occasion. Their conduct was so much resented by their royal parents, that when a concert was given at Windsor soon after the King's recovery, the Queen sent them a message, informing them 'that 'they would be welcome to the concert, but that she thought it 'fair to let them know that the entertainment was intended for 'those who had supported the King and Queen on the late 'occasion.'† When the intelligence of the duel between the Duke of York and Colonel Lennox (which took place on the 26th of May following) reached the palace, the Queen received it with indifference, and Her Majesty shortly afterwards invited Colonel Lennox to a ball, where she treated him with marked attention. Colonel Lennox was nephew and heir to the Duke of Richmond, who was at this time a cabinet minister; and his second in the duel, who delivered the challenge to the Duke of York, was Lord Winchilsea, who was, and continued to be, a lord of the bedchamber, and therefore a member of the royal household. The King likewise wrote a letter to the Duke of Clarence, expressing his displeasure at the unkindness which he had met with from his two elder sons during his illness. In consequence of the reproaches contained in this letter, a long memorial, in vindication of the conduct of the Prince and the Duke of York, was drawn up by Sir Gilbert Elliot (afterwards Earl of Minto), and delivered by the Prince to the King. This, and a letter to the King, likewise drawn up by Sir Gilbert Elliot, which was not sent, are printed for the first time in the 'Memorials of Fox' (vol. ii. pp. 308-355.); they contain much curious authentic information respecting the course taken by the Prince during the King's malady, and exhibit the entire alienation from his parents which his conduct produced.‡

* Posthumous Memoirs, vol. iii. p. 369.

† Lord Campbell says that George III. always believed that those 'who opposed the restrictions upon the Regent had formed a conspiracy to prevent his remounting the throne.' (Vol. vi. p. 209.)

‡ The draft of a letter from the Prince to the King, in Lord Loughborough's handwriting, among the Boslyn MSS., printed by Lord Campbell, vol. vi. p. 212. (beginning with the words, 'Thinking it probable') had been already printed by Moore in his 'Life of Sheridan,' c. 13., (from the rough copy of Sheridan). Compare 'Memoirs of Fox,' vol. ii. p. 339.

It appears from Miss Burney's Diary (Nov. 8.), that early in November the Prince of Wales took the government of the house at Windsor Castle entirely into his own hands. Nothing was done but by his orders, and he was applied to in every difficulty. The Queen interfered in nothing; she retired to a separate apartment, and lived in seclusion with her daughters. We learn, however, from the Prince's Memorial, that when the King had been removed to Kew, the Prince was, by the Queen's order, denied all access to him, and that the care of his Majesty's person was henceforth exclusively assumed by the Queen. The Prince attributes the change to her displeasure at his having, after the removal to Kew, taken possession of the money, jewels, and papers belonging to the King. This measure, as it is described by the Prince, appears, however, to have been quite proper; he confided the money and jewels to Lord Brudenell, the keeper of the privy purse*, and the papers were locked up in the drawers where they were deposited, the keys being enclosed in a paper, sealed with the seal of Lord Weymouth, the Groom of the Stole.† We may remark that the King's papers are described by the Prince, who had on this occasion personally inspected them, as 'arranged with great regularity and method;' and they were left, untouched, 'exactly in the places and order in which his Majesty had deposited them.' George III. was now in the twenty-ninth year of his reign, and the accumulation of papers in his possession was doubtless considerable. It may be presumed that he continued, up to the time when he ceased to perform the regal functions (1811), to preserve his papers, and to keep them in order. The communications which he received from his successive ministers would, if published, form a historical collection of the highest value. What was the fate of George III.'s papers, and whether they are still in existence, we know not. They must have been in the custody of the Duke of York at the time when he had the charge of the King's person. We have reason to believe that no part of them has ever come into the possession of Her present Majesty.—No reconciliation between the Queen and the Prince took place until March, 1791; about two years and a half after the commencement of the King's illness.‡

* James Lord Brudenell, born 1725, succeeded his elder brother, the Duke of Montagu, as Earl of Cardigan in 1790.

† Thomas Viscount Weymouth, eldest son of the Marquis of Bath, was Groom of the Stole (which corresponds to the present office of Mistress of the Robes) from 1782 to 1796, in which year he succeeded his father.

‡ It appears from Lord Malmesbury's 'Diary' that the Prince of

The King's sudden restoration to health, and the practical settlement of the Regency question which it effected, preceded, by a few months, the greatest political event of modern times; the outbreak of the French Revolution. On the 10th of March, 1789, Parliament was reopened by commission after the King's recovery. On the 14th of July following, the Bastille was taken. Henceforth, until the peace of 1815, not only all the international relations of England with the Continent, but its domestic politics, continued to be influenced by the French Revolution and its consequences. It was believed in France, by the speakers of the Convention, that their revolution would destroy Pitt's power, and put an end to his political ascendancy.* No anticipation could be more false. Not many months had elapsed before the Whig Party was divided by differences of opinion respecting the changes in France; after a time a large section of it openly joined the Minister, while that part which adhered to Mr. Fox lost its popularity in the country, and was dispirited in Parliament by the secession of its leader.

The general feeling of England at the taking of the Bastille was doubtless one of joy and approbation. It was thought to betoken the advent of a more free and popular regimen in France, and to threaten the well-known abuses of its government with destruction. When Mr. Fox said, in writing at the time to Mr. Fitzpatrick, 'How much the greatest event it is that ever happened in the world, and how much the best!' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 361.), he probably went beyond the popular sentiment of his countrymen, but he coincided with its general direction. Burke, however, was from the very beginning hostile to the movement in France: and as the progress of events began to disclose its character, his opinions spread to many other Whigs, closely connected with Fox by personal and party ties. A meeting of the leading members of the Whig Party was held at the Duke of Portland's house on the 11th of February, 1790, when a discussion, stated to have been conducted on both sides with remarkable ability, was carried on from ten o'clock at night to three o'clock in the morning; but it failed in reconciling the opinions of Fox and Burke; and the breach remained as wide as before.† In the

Wales was on excellent terms with the Queen in July, 1792. (Vol. ii. p. 450.)

* 'Les inquiétudes du premier ministre Pitt, maître absolu de l'Angleterre depuis huit ans, et que les orages d'une révolution ou ceux d'une guerre menacent également de sa chute,' &c. (*Kersaint, Speech in the Convention*, 1 Jan. 1793, *Moniteur*, Jan. 3.)

† Adolphus, vol. iv. p. 542.

summer of the same year, Burke wrote his 'Reflections on the French Revolution,' and published them in the month of November. Of this work 30,000 copies are stated to have been sold; and it exercised an immense influence upon the opinion of the country. 'It was,' Professor Smyth remarks, 'read by every man of intelligence in the kingdom.' The views taken by Burke contributed powerfully to mould public opinion into a form hostile to the movement in France; and this hostility was greatly strengthened by the deposition of Louis XVI., on the 10th of August, 1792, and by his execution in the January following. Burke had formally announced his separation from Mr. Fox, on account of his opinions respecting the French Revolution, in the strange scene which occurred in the House of Commons during the debates on the Quebec Bill in the spring of 1791.* A partial junction of the Whigs with Mr. Pitt's Government began to be agitated in June 1792.† It was not, however, until 1794 that the great secession of the Whig Party from their leader took place. In that year the Duke of Portland, Lord Fitzwilliam, Lord Spencer, Mr. Windham, Mr. Grenville, and the majority of the parliamentary Whigs, joined the Administration, some of them with office. Lord Loughborough, the confidential adviser of the Prince during the Regency Debates, had already accepted the Great Seal in January 1793. The grounds of difference between Mr. Fox and his seceding friends are thus stated by Mr. Grenville in a letter to him written at the time: —

'The main points of difference between us are two: the one is respecting the war with France, which you condemn and oppose, while I think it the greatest of all duties to support and maintain it to the utmost; the other respects an apprehension which I entertain of those principles and designs in this country adverse to the constitution of it, which makes me feel it to be my duty to resist whatever

* A careful account of the controversy between Burke and Fox on the occasion of the Quebec Bill is given in the fifth and sixth chapters of the 'Annual Register' for 1791. Burke ceased to write the historical portion of the 'Annual Register' about 1788, but he probably retained some control over it until his death in 1797. See also Moore's 'Life of Sheridan,' c. xiv. A tolerably fair view of the state of English parties at this time, and of the causes of the separation of Fox and Burke, is taken by Sir Archibald Alison in his 'History of Europe,' c. vii.

† See Lord Malmesbury's 'Diaries,' vol. ii. p. 453., where a meeting at Burlington House, of the Duke of Portland, Lord Fitzwilliam, Lord Loughborough, and Burke, held for the discussion of this subject, is described.

can give to such designs either strength, opportunity, or countenance, while you, on the other hand, believe in no such designs, and believe the danger to arise from there being too little spirit of free inquiry and resistance in the minds of the people of this country. Either of these subjects of difference existing between us would tell very much in public conduct, but both united extend very widely indeed, and must in their direct course, or at least in their bearings and consequences, pervade almost all measures of public discussion.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. iii. p. 63.)

'The fervid writings of Burke,' says Lord J. Russell; 'the general alarm felt at the subversive doctrines and horrible massacres of the French Republican Government; the aid of more than half the Parliamentary Party which had hitherto followed Mr. Fox, and the entire confidence of the King, made Mr. Pitt far stronger in war than he had been in peace.' It seems that in 1792, before the acceptance of the Great Seal by Lord Loughborough, a general negotiation for the junction of the Whigs, including Mr. Fox, took place with Mr. Pitt. The negotiation was fruitless, so far as Mr. Fox was concerned; but Lord John thinks that 'if Mr. Pitt had offered directly to Mr. Fox the Foreign Office, with the leadership of the House of Lords, there can be little doubt that Mr. Fox, however reluctant, would have accepted the offer.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. iii. p. 21. 248.) Lord Holland informs us that 'Mr. Fox about this time had a very secret interview with Mr. Pitt, in which the latter proposed a coalition of parties, with many conditions somewhat unpalatable, though not utterly inadmissible, or in the least dishonourable, except the exclusion of men, and particularly of Sheridan, to which Mr. Fox would not listen.' (*Mem. of Whig Party*, vol. i. p. 30.) Dean Pellew, in his 'Life of Lord Sidmouth,' says of this negotiation, that 'it was intended that Mr. Fox himself should be included; but he resolutely declined, unless Mr. Pitt would previously resign the premiership; a proposal which, of course, put an end to the whole arrangement.'* A similar proposition was made to

* Vol. i. p. 89. Dean Pellew adds: 'To this occasion an anecdote of Lord Sidmouth respecting Mr. Burke may probably be referred. Mr. Pitt was negotiating with Mr. Burke for the accession of the Duke of Portland and his friends to the Government; and in speaking of terms of adjustment with France, he observed that they ought to be founded on the basis of indemnity for the past and security for the future. On this Mr. Burke, who had no relish for any such arrangement, drew himself up, and pompously said, "Sir, I am authorised by the Duke of Portland to state that he abhors indemnity, and detests security." Lord Malmesbury mentions in

Mr. Pitt, on behalf of the Foxite party, during the struggle in the spring of 1784, and it put an end to the negotiation which had been then commenced for a union of parties.

It is certain that Pitt was drawn reluctantly into the war. He desired to observe a strict neutrality with respect to France; and he did, in fact, observe it so long as he was able. His policy was founded on the continuance of peace. We have reason to know that he, an early disciple of Adam Smith, contemplated at this time a larger measure of Free Trade than the National Debt, accumulated during the subsequent war, now permits;—we mean, an abolition of all Custom Duties, and a limitation of the public income to internal taxation.* His Sinking Fund scheme was proposed in 1792. ‘At that time,’ (says Dr. Marsh, in his work on the origin of the French war), ‘Mr. Pitt’s favourite object was a diminution of the National Debt, the abolition of taxes, the promotion of commerce and of general welfare throughout the kingdom; the attainment of which would necessarily be impeded by the expenses of a foreign war.’† The leaders of the Convention, on the other

several places the demand of the Duke of Portland and Mr. Fox that Mr. Pitt should resign the office of First Lord of the Treasury, in order to prepare the way for their junction. (Vol. ii. pp. 459. 465. 468. 472, 473.)

* Pitt did not escape the sarcasms about exclusive attachment to pounds, shillings, and pence, and neglect of science and literature, which have been levelled at more modern ministers.

‘*Author.* Pitt views alike, from Holwood’s sullen brow,
(As near-observing friendship dares avow)
The fount of Pindus or Bœotia’s bog,
With nothing of Mæcenas, but his frog.

Oct. Mere spleen to Pitt; he’s liberal, but hÿ stealth.

Auth. Yes, and he spares a nation’s inborn wealth,
Another Adam in economy;
For all, but Burke, escape his searching eye.
Stiff from old Turgot and his rigid school,
He never deviates from his wholesome rule:
“Left to themselves, all find their level price,
Potatoes, verses, turnips, Greek, and rice.”

(*Pursuits of Literature* (by Matthias) part ii.)

It seems that the seal of Mæcenas, attached to decrees for the collection of taxes, had the figure of a frog. (*Plin. H. N.* xxxvii. 4.)

† Herbert Marsh, ‘History of the Politics of Great Britain and France, from the Conference at Pillnitz to the Declaration of War against Great Britain.’ (London: 1800. 2 vols.) Vol. i. p. 51., and see p. 194. This work contains an elaborate examination, founded

hand, were obviously desirous of provoking a war with England, unless they could compel the English Government to bend to their policy. It may be argued that Pitt erred in refusing to acknowledge the Republican Government of France, after the dethronement and execution of the King; in recalling Lord Gower from Paris, and in dismissing Chauvelin from London. But we do not believe that a recognition of the French Republic, and a continuance of diplomatic intercourse on the new footing, would have sufficed to prevent the Convention from declaring war against England, unless our Government had professed itself friendly to the principles of the French Revolution. As it was, the grounds upon which the Convention declared war against England (on the 1st of February, 1793), were frivolous almost beyond example.* Mr. Fox and his few friends would have been prepared, with certain limitations, to have made such a profession of faith.† But neither Parliament nor the country

on documentary evidence, of the grounds of the French war. Dr. Marsh justifies the course adopted by the English Government, but we do not agree with Professor Smyth (Lect. xxxv. on the French Revolution) that 'it is the statement of a diligent and able advocate, the statement of one side of the question only; nothing is said on the other.' It appears to us, on the contrary, that the facts are fairly stated on both sides, though judgment is given in favour of England. We think it quite possible to arrive on many points at conclusions quite different from those of Dr. Marsh upon his own statement of the facts. Lord Malmesbury has the following entry in his Diary, under March 29. 1801, soon after the dissolution of Mr. Pitt's long ministry:—'Pitt, I am told from authority, encourages Addington in his pacific plans, states the finances of the country to be such as require peace. I always perceived these to supersede in Pitt's mind every other consideration, and that even when he declared the loudest, and with the greatest emphasis, for a continuation of war, his real and genuine opinion went for peace.' (Vol. iv. p. 53.)

* This is remarked in a previous number of this Journal, vol. lxxvii. p. 353., where the subject is fully examined. A different view is taken by Professor Smyth in his thirty-fifth lecture on the French Revolution.

† The following extracts from Mr. Fox's letters illustrate his opinions on the French revolution and war, and certainly they are strangely at variance with the views now entertained by all parties in this country:—'*I do not think near so ill of the business of the 10th of August as I did upon first hearing it. If the King and his Ministers were really determined not to act in concert with the Assembly, and, still more, if they secretly favoured the invasion of the barbarians, it was necessary, at any rate, to begin by getting rid of him and them.*' (Sept. 3. 1792.)

would have supported a Ministry which announced its adhesion to the principles of the French Revolution; and the King would have viewed it with greater abhorrence than he had even felt for the Coalition Ministry at the time of the India Bill.* Such was the fanaticism about political forms which prevailed at this time,—a fanaticism not less fervid than that which existed about religious tenets in the 16th century,—that, while this country refused to acknowledge a Republican Government in France, the French Government treated every king, whatever

‘I exactly agree with you, that for France alone Robespierre is worse than any other despotism; but that for the general good, considering the diabolical principle of the present war, *even his government*, or a worse, if worse can be, *is better than the restoration of the Bourbons.*’ (May 17. 1795.) ‘A greater evil than the restoration of the Bourbons to the world in general, and England in particular, can hardly happen. You will be happy, as I am, to hear of the ill success of the emigrants [at Quiberon], but you will be astonished to hear that Ministers are so far from being discouraged by it that they are more sanguine than ever in their hopes of re-establishing Louis XVIII.’ (July 28. 1795.) ‘Everybody says that the country is nearly unanimous for peace, but they do nothing in consequence of their opinion, and the Ministers are, I believe, as warlike as ever. An expedition is, after all, gone to France, under General Doyle, consisting of 4000 British, besides emigrants, &c.; it is supposed they are destined to Noirmoutier. I think nothing can show the complete infatuation of our Government so much as this desperate expedition, which, *I believe, as well as hope*, has not the smallest chance of success.’ (Sept. 10. 1795.) ‘My letters tell me what I can scarce credit, that the Ministers have given a flat refusal to the Great Consul’s proposition to treat. Surely they must be quite mad.’—‘I approve of Bonaparte’s letter very much indeed; and what an answer! *Surely they must think as meanly of the people of this country as I do.* Restore monarchy or show us that you can behave peaceably for some time before we can treat; and this experience of peaceable demeanour is desired during the war.’ (Jan. 1800.) ‘I cannot help thinking that Bonaparte will not be so rancorous as you apprehend, and that he will find it for the interest, both of his glory and of his power, to continue in the system of moderation.’ (Oct. 1800.) ‘The refusing Bonaparte’s offers, first in January and then in October, are faults, in my judgment, without a parallel in history.’ (Jan. 24. 1801.)

* This question is well treated by Moore, in his ‘Life of Sheridan,’ ch. xvi., whose views on this portion of our history are remarkably sound and judicious. Lord Brougham, ‘Sketches of Statesmen,’ vol. i. pp. 60. 280., is of opinion that Mr. Pitt entered upon the French war from motives of selfish ambition, merely in order to consolidate his power, and that by uniting with Mr. Fox he might have prevented the war. We doubt the truth of both these propositions.

his powers might be, as a tyrant. They accordingly placed England under the ban of their anathema, and regarded it as a country with which peace was impossible. The only part which Fox could play, consistently with his opinions on the French Revolution, was to continue an unavailing protest against the war; but even this course brought his party to so low an ebb, that, near the end of the century, the entire Opposition was said, in joke, not to have filled more than one hackney coach, when they left the House of Commons.* All struggle between Fox and Pitt had at this time ceased; and when Pitt resigned in February, 1801, and was succeeded by Addington, Fox saw no prospect of any return to power,—except, indeed, from the favour of the Prince of Wales, in the event of a Regency, which the King's state then rendered probable. In a letter to Lord Holland, dated April 19. 1801, he expresses himself thus:—

‘ Seriously speaking, I cannot conceive what you mean by everybody agreeing that something may be now done. I beg, at least, not to be included among the holders of that opinion; for, as it appears to me, there never was a moment when all exertion on our part was more certain to be useless, if not worse. . . . My present notion is, that except for Tooke's business (which I could not desert without shabbiness), and the May Whig Club, I shall go to town no more this year. . . . It must be from movements out of doors, and not in Parliament, that Opposition can ever gain any strength; I mean, of course, as Opposition. What the King's death or illness might produce is another question.’ (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. iii. p. 189.)

The views and conduct of the English Government with respect to war, in the early part of the Revolution, appear clearly from Lord Grenville's letters. On September 14. 1789,

* ‘ I heard old George Byng say, at the dinner given to him to celebrate the 50th anniversary of his having sat for Middlesex, alluding to those times, “ It has been asserted that the Whigs “ would all have been held in one hackney coach. This is a calumny. “ We should have filled two.”’ (*Lord Campbell's Lives of Chancellors*, vol. v. p. 614.) Mr. Byng sat for Middlesex from 1790. Lord Holland says, ‘ The war was as popular out of doors as in Parliament, and perhaps even more so. Even there the minority was small; in the Commons 40, and in the Lords only 4.’ (*Memoirs of Whig Party*, vol. i. p. 30.) Lord Bexley gives the story of the coach as a matter of fact. In a letter to Dean Pellew, he says of Mr. Fox's secession from Parliament,—‘ By means of that secession Mr. Tierney became the leader of the Opposition, such as it then was. You may judge of their numbers by the circumstance that they generally went home to dinner with Tyrwhit Jones in his coach.’ (*Life of Lord Sidmouth*, vol. ii. p. 135.)

being then Home Secretary, he thus writes to the Marquis of Buckingham:—

‘We have no sort of news. The French Assembly is going on with endless disputes about their Constitution; but one ought to be much more interested than I feel myself in the event of these disputes, not to be heartily tired of hearing of them. The main point appears quite secure,—that they will not, for many years, be in a situation to molest the invaluable peace which we now enjoy.’

In May, 1791, Lord Grenville was transferred from the Home to the Foreign Department, and on the 17th of August of that year, he writes to his brother as follows:—

‘I hope I shall now begin to breathe a little, which I have hardly done since April last. You can hardly form to yourself an idea of the labour I have gone through; but I am repaid by the maintenance of peace, which is all this country has to desire. We shall now, I hope, *for a very long period indeed enjoy this blessing*, and cultivate a situation of prosperity unexampled in our history. The state of our commerce, our revenue, and, above all, that of our public funds, is such as to hold out ideas which but a few years ago would indeed have appeared visionary, and which there is now every hope of realising.’

His long and interesting letter upon the war of Austria and Prussia against France, and the policy of this country with reference to it, written on the 7th of November, 1792, three months before war was declared by the Convention against England, proves conclusively that the English Government had hitherto abstained from all interference in the hostilities against France:—

‘The events you read in the newspapers, often before I get them, and they have been such as it could give me little pleasure to detail. The causes have been hid *caliginosa nocte*, and I have been among the guessers only, and not always among those who were luckiest in their guesses. I bless God that we had the wit to keep ourselves out of the glorious enterprise of the combined armies, and that we were not tempted by the hope of sharing the spoils in the division of France, by the prospect of crushing all democratical principles all over the world at one blow. But, having so sturdily resisted all solicitation to join in these plans, we have been punished for our obstinacy by having been kept in profound ignorance of the details by which they were to be executed, and even of the course of events, as far as that could be done, which occurred during the progress of the enterprise. . . . All my ambition is that I may, at some time hereafter, when I am freed from all active concern in such a scene as this is, have the inexpressible satisfaction of being able to look back upon it, and to tell myself that I have contributed to keep my own country at least a little longer from sharing in all the evils of every sort that

surround us. I am more and more convinced that this can only be done by keeping wholly and entirely aloof, and by watching much at home, but doing very little indeed; endeavouring to nurse up in the country a real determination to stand by the Constitution when it is attacked, as it most infallibly will be if these things go on; and, above all, trying to make the situation of the lower orders among us as good as it can be made. In this view, I have seen, with the greatest satisfaction, the steps taken in different parts of the country for increasing wages, which I hold to be a point of absolute necessity, and of a hundred times more importance than all that the most doing government could do in twenty years towards keeping the country quiet. I trust we may again be enabled to contribute to the same object by the repeal of taxes; but of that we cannot yet be sure. Sure I am—at least, I think myself so, that these are the best means in our power to delay what, perhaps, nothing can ultimately avert, if it is decreed that we are again to be plunged into barbarism.’ (Vol. ii. p. 222-4.) •

Lord Grenville’s view of the war, when it had been once begun, is expressed in a letter of September 17th, 1794:—

‘I have no other view of the contest in which we are engaged, nor ever have had, than that the existence of the two systems of Government is fairly at stake, and in the words of St. Just (whose curious speech I hope you have seen), that it is perfect blindness not to see that in the establishment of the French Republic is included the overthrow of all the other governments of Europe. If this view of the subject is just, there can be [no] worse economy than that which spares the expense of present exertion, and incurs the probability of increased risk, and the necessity of protracted efforts.’*

The following remarks of Lord Grenville, made in a letter of April 28th, 1797, with reference to the French war, whatever truth they may have had at that time, are not applicable to the state of the popular mind in this country since the commencement of the war with Russia:—

‘It is a curious speculation in history to see how often the good people of England have played this game over and over again, and how incorrigible they are in it.* To desire war without reflection,—to be unreasonably elated with success,—to be still more unreasonably depressed by difficulties,—and to call out for peace with an impatience which makes suitable terms unattainable, are the established maxims and the regular progress of the popular mind in this country. Yet, such as it is, it is worth all the other countries of the world put together; so we must not too much complain of it.’

* Mr. Pitt in a letter to Mr. Addington, of Oct. 4. 1795, speaks of opening his budget before Christmas, ‘and if that goes off tolerably well, it will give us peace before Easter.’ (*Pellett’s Life of Lord Sidmouth*, vol. i. p. 157.)

After having described Burke's policy of a crusade against the revolutionary government of France, Lord John Russell proceeds to say:—

‘Happily his advice was disregarded. Mr. Pitt took a totally different view of the nature and objects of the war. He was ready to admit that we had nothing to do with the internal government of France, provided its rulers were disposed and able to maintain friendly relations with foreign governments. He sought to confine France within her ancient limits, to oblige her to respect established treaties, and to renounce her conquests. He sought, by expeditions to the West Indies, an indemnity for the expenses of the war. In short, he treated Robespierre and Carnot as he would have treated any other French rulers, whose ambition was to be resisted, and whose interference in the affairs of other nations was to be checked and prevented.’ (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. iii. p. 32.)

In a letter addressed to Burke on September 6th, 1792, respecting the recall of the English Ambassador from Paris, Lord Grenville marks the difference between their opinions on the policy to be observed towards France. ‘If our opinions,’ he says, ‘do not on all points agree, I well know that we have ‘the same object in view; that the King’s conduct in this ‘crisis should be such as may best tend to preserve these ‘kingdoms from the contagion of the evils which have ruined ‘France.’*

It was not, however, the question of peace or war with France, or the opposition of Mr. Fox, which was destined to bring Mr. Pitt’s long administration to an end. Its termination was due to internal causes; to circumstances connected, indeed, with important subjects, but small in themselves. What great men, and great questions, and great Parliamentary conflicts had not been able to effect, was done by a quibble about the Coronation Oath.

‘Finem animæ, quæ res humanas miscuit olim,
Non gladii, non saxa dābunt, non tela; sed ille
Cannarum vindex, et tanti sanguinis ultor
Annulus.’

After the union with Ireland had been carried, Mr. Pitt decided on proposing that the exclusion of Roman Catholics from public offices and Parliament should be abolished. His main reason seems to have been that this measure, which might have been attended with danger in a purely Irish Parliament, could not fail of being beneficial when one Parliament was elected for the United Kingdom. The Catholic influence,

* Correspondence of Burke (1814), vol. iii. p. 532.

which might have preponderated in an Irish Parliament, would be counteracted and reduced to safe dimensions by the Protestant majority of an Imperial Parliament. His convictions on this subject must likewise have been strengthened by the deplorable events of which Ireland had been the theatre during the recent rebellion, and by the prevalence in that country of a disaffected spirit, which facilitated the hostile designs of France. With the removal of civil disqualifications upon the Catholic laity was to be combined a state provision for the Catholic clergy, which, so long as their religion was subject to legal disabilities, they would necessarily refuse to accept; and also a change in the law respecting tithes. This great and healing measure was frustrated by the personal objections of the Sovereign, whose sensitive conscience rendered him an easy prey to artful and selfish counsellors, and whose reason, since his illness of 1788, afforded him but a feeble protection against their practices. Its failure at the time when it was proposed, has been an irreparable calamity to our generation. It retarded the measure of Catholic emancipation by a quarter of a century, and left it to be extorted by intimidation. It created O'Connell's power and gave importance to the Repeal agitation; above all, it has left the Protestant and Catholic churches of Ireland in their present anomalous state, with little prospect of this great defect in our internal polity being removed by a fair and equitable adjustment.*

The secret history of the means by which this unfortunate result was produced, is now known to us from the documents published in Lord Campbell's *Life of Lord Loughborough*, in Dean Pellew's *Life of Lord Sidmouth*, and in the *Castlereagh Correspondence*, illustrated by the entries in Lord Malmesbury's *Diary*. The Act of Union received the Royal assent in July 1800. In the following month the Cabinet began to discuss the measures which Mr. Pitt intended to propose as the sequel of the Union; and in September he wrote to Lord Loughborough, who was then in attendance on the King at Weymouth, to request him to return to London for their consideration.† It appears that Mr. Pitt did not intend to submit the plan to the King at this stage of the business. His Majesty

* We refer our readers, with great satisfaction, to the excellent remarks of Mr. Macaulay, in which he proves the utter emptiness of the fancy which took possession of the King's mind, and dwells on its disastrous consequences. ('Hist. of England,' vol. iii. p. 117.)

† See Lord Loughborough's narrative, written in 1801, and circulated among his friends, in Lord Campbell's '*Lives of the Chancellors*,' vol. vi. p. 322-6. Mr. Pitt's letter is in p. 306.

was known, since 1795, to have been disinclined to the removal of Catholic disabilities, on account of a supposed inconsistency with his Coronation Oath. Lord Loughborough, however, showed the King Mr. Pitt's letter before he left Weymouth, and thus disclosed to him Mr. Pitt's intentions. Lord Malmesbury had likewise heard that the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Moore, at the suggestion of his brother-in-law, Lord Auckland*, wrote to the King, when at Weymouth, to inform him of the measure contemplated by the Ministers, and to warn him against its adoption.† Lord Loughborough, on his return to London, prepared a statement of his objections to the proposed measure, which he circulated among his colleagues, and of which he gave a copy to the King.‡ He likewise, at the same time, assured His Majesty, in answer to his inquiry, that the Cabinet had as yet decided nothing on the Catholic question. It appears, further, from authentic information furnished to Lord Castlereagh, that Dr. Stuart, the Archbishop of Armagh, had been confidentially consulted by the King during the winter, and had contributed to strengthen his feelings against the proposed measure of comprehension.§

Lord Castlereagh, the chief secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant, had attended the consultations of the Cabinet, in September, upon the Irish questions; and before the meeting of the Imperial Parliament in the beginning of 1801, he was again summoned to London by the Duke of Portland, the Home Secretary, to confer with the English Ministers. Upon his arrival in London, at the end of December, he took alarm at the Chancellor's opposition; and he probably may have heard reports of

* Dr. Moore was married to Miss Catherine Eden, eldest sister of William, the first Lord Auckland. Lord Auckland had been Joint Postmaster-General since 1798. He retained the office under the Addington Ministry, and was turned out by Mr. Pitt upon his return to power in 1804.

† Diaries, vol. iv. p. 16. 20.

‡ This paper, which was in answer to a paper written by Lord Castlereagh, and circulated to the Cabinet, is printed in Pellew's 'Life of Lord Sidmouth,' vol. i. p. 500-512. It was communicated to the Lord-Lieutenant. Lord Castlereagh's paper, marked 'most secret,' is printed in the Castlereagh Correspondence, vol. iv. pp. 392-400.

§ Mem. and Cor. of Lord Castlereagh, vol. iv. p. 83. It seems from a letter of Lord Cornwallis that the Irish primate went to England in January, 1801, (ib. p. 21.) The Lord-Lieutenant was mistaken in believing him to be 'by no means an anti-Catholic,' and 'not disposed to do mischief in a certain quarter.' Dr. W. Stuart was son of the Earl of Bute, George III.'s early Minister.

the difficulty to be anticipated from the King. He accordingly, on the 1st of January, 1801, wrote a letter to Mr. Pitt, representing to him the disappointment which Lord Cornwallis would feel, if the views expressed in Lord Loughborough's paper were adopted by the Cabinet. In this important letter Lord Castlereagh recalls to Mr. Pitt's recollection the communications formerly made by the Cabinet, through himself, to Lord Cornwallis, in reference to the Catholic question. He states that he was in England in the autumn of 1799, and was in communication with the Cabinet as to the means of carrying the Union in the Irish Parliament, after the unsuccessful attempt of the previous Session. By Lord Cornwallis's desire, he represented to the Cabinet the facility which would be derived in Ireland from its being in his power to give to the Catholics such a promise with respect to their claims, as would obtain their support for the Union. Lord Castlereagh says, that at this time, the Cabinet were unanimous in favour of the principle of Catholic relief; and, although they anticipated considerable repugnance to it in many quarters, and particularly in the highest, they authorised him to assure Lord Cornwallis that he need not anticipate any difficulty in dealing with the Catholics, so far as the Cabinet were concerned; and that he was fully warranted in soliciting from the Catholics every support for the Union which they could afford. Of this authority, he proceeds to say, Lord Cornwallis availed himself; and, at the desire of Lord Cornwallis, he recalled the attention of the Cabinet to the subject when he was in England in the previous autumn of 1800. Upon his return to Dublin he apprised Lord Cornwallis that sentiments unfavourable to the concession had been expressed by Lord Loughborough; and that the Cabinet were unable, in the King's absence from London, to take a final decision on so momentous a question; but that he had no reason to expect that the expectations formed by Lord Cornwallis would be disappointed. Lord Castlereagh finally impresses upon Mr. Pitt the regret which Lord Cornwallis would experience at the abandonment of the measure, and the painful position in which it would place him with respect to the Catholic body.* Shortly after this letter Lord Castlereagh appears to have received an assurance from Mr. Pitt, that he would adhere to his measure, notwithstanding the obstacles which threatened him; for, on the 14th of January, Lord Cornwallis writes to Lord Castlereagh:—'Your letter, dated the 7th,

* *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Castlereagh*, vol. iv. pp. 8–12.

'afforded me very sincere satisfaction. If Mr. Pitt is firm, he will meet with no difficulty; and the misfortunes of the present times are much in his favour towards carrying this point, on the same grounds that the Rebellion assisted the Union.' On the 22nd of January, he writes again to Lord Castlereagh:— 'All your last letters have administered real comfort to me. We now shall turn that great measure of the Union to real profit, at the same time that we are adopting the only means of resisting the hostility of almost all Europe.*

Notwithstanding Lord Cornwallis's sanguine predictions, the last act of the drama was now at hand. Mr. Pitt's firmness in maintaining the cause of the Catholics produced no impression on the unreasoning mind of the King, poisoned by secret advisers. On the 31st of January, Mr. Pitt addressed to His Majesty a long and elaborate letter, containing what may be considered his ultimatum on the subject. In this letter he submits to the King the conclusions of his confidential servants upon the important questions respecting the Catholics and Dissenters, which would naturally be agitated in consequence of the Union. Mr. Pitt proceeds to say:— 'The knowledge of Your Majesty's general indisposition to any change of the laws on this subject, would have made this a painful task to him; and it is become much more so by learning from some of his colleagues, and from other quarters, within these few days, the extent to which Your Majesty entertains, and has declared, that sentiment.† Mr. Pitt then states that the majority of the Cabinet concur with him in proposing the removal of the political disabilities of Catholics and Dissenters, and a public provision for the Catholic clergy of Ireland—that his views in favour of these measures are unalterably fixed; and, if he is not at liberty to bring them forward with the King's full con-

* *Memoirs, &c.* pp. 20, 21. The battle of Marengo was fought in June, 1800, the battle of Hohenlinden on Dec. 8. 1800. The maritime confederacy of the Northern Powers was signed on Dec. 16. 1800. The isolated and perilous situation of England at this time is described by Alison, *'History of Europe,'* vol. iv. p. 486. ed. 1842.

† These words are inconsistent with the circumstantial statement in the Castlereagh Correspondence (derived at second hand from the Archbishop of Armagh) that Mr. Pitt sent Lord Castlereagh's papers to the King in September, and had mentioned the subject to him on the 13th and 18th of December, and that the King had then said, that sooner than concede he would part with his life (vol. iv. p. 83.); and also with the account of the 'long letter' to Mr. Pitt from the King, when he was at Weymouth, in Lord Malmesbury's *'Diary,'* vol. iv. p. 21.

currence, and with the whole weight of government, his first wish is to be released from his official situation. • He terminates his letter with assuring the King of his readiness to remain in the discharge of his duties until a new administration can be formed. The King's answer puts forward the Coronation Oath as a bar to the proposed measure, but suggests, as a compromise, that both he and Mr. Pitt should agree to be silent on the subject. Mr. Pitt refuses to accede to these terms, and repeats the offer of his resignation, which the King, by a letter dated February 5., accepts.*

It is evident from the tone of Mr. Pitt's first letter, and from Lord Grenville's letter to Lord Buckingham, written on the next day but one before the King's answer had been received, that Mr. Pitt believed the King's resolution to be immovable, and expected, when he wrote, that his resignation would be accepted. The mutual conduct of the King and Mr. Pitt on this occasion, and the manner in which the King put an end to his connexion with a statesman who had guided the helm during the storms of the Coalition, the Regency, and the French Revolution, is a remarkable proof of the want of cordiality and confidence which subsisted between this sovereign and his ministers. Although the measures relative to the Catholics had been under the consideration of the Cabinet since the preceding autumn, no intimation of them was made by Mr. Pitt to the King until his formal communication of January 31., when the King's adverse decision had been virtually formed and promulgated. Even when this communication had been made, everything passed in writing, and Mr. Pitt's administration of above seventeen years' duration was brought to a close without any oral explanation between the King and his Minister upon the measure which formed the ground of difference, although the latter considered it of vital importance to the interests of the empire, and the former considered it as involving a violation of his coronation oath. Lord Malmesbury attributes Pitt's conduct to indolence, or to want of respect for the King; but it seems unlikely that he failed in this matter from neglect; probably he distrusted the influence of reason upon the King's mind, and hoped to bear him down at the last moment by the authority of an united cabinet. It may be observed that the relations of

* Mr. Pitt's correspondence with the King on this occasion was published by Bishop Philpotts in 1827, and is reprinted in the 'Quarterly Review,' vol. xxxvi. pp. 290-5. It was printed from copies taken at the time by Lord Kenyon, to whom the originals were communicated by the King.

George III. with his political servants were in general distant and stiff. We will not assert that no minister of this king ever sat in his presence, but we believe that such occasions were extremely rare; none of that confiding and frequent intercourse which subsequent sovereigns have kept up with their ministers, to the great advantage of public business, existed in his reign. The King had known, since the autumn of 1800, that a plan for removing Catholic disabilities was under the consideration of the Cabinet; he had conversed upon it with Lord Loughborough at Weymouth in September, and had seen Mr. Pitt's letter on the subject; he had subsequently spoken to Lord Loughborough in London about it, had inquired as to the decision of the Cabinet, and had obtained Lord Loughborough's paper of objections; he had also received private communications from the Archbishops of Canterbury and Armagh. So well-informed was he of the intentions of Ministers, that his negotiation with Mr. Addington was commenced before Mr. Pitt's letter reached him. In writing to Mr. Addington on January 29., the King speaks conjecturally of Mr. Pitt's opinion; and in a subsequent letter of February 7. he says that the subject had not been communicated to him till Sunday, February 11. — the day on which he read Mr. Pitt's letter. If, however, the King had acted openly to Mr. Pitt, he would, at the time when he was receiving objections and warnings from the Chancellor and the Archbishops, have questioned Mr. Pitt on the subject, and have invited him to explain his intentions.

Sir Archibald Alison, in his 'History of Europe,' repeats a suspicion thrown out by former writers, that the Catholic question was merely the ostensible ground of Mr. Pitt's resignation, and that he withdrew from office in order to make way for a minister who should have greater facilities than himself for agreeing to a peace.* Lord Campbell and Lord John Russell concur in rejecting this hypothesis†; and an attentive perusal of the various original documents which have of late been brought to light, convinces us of its utter groundlessness. No

* History of Europe, vol. iv. pp. 492-5.

† Lives of the Chancellors, vol. vi. p. 296.; Mem. of Fox, vol. iii. p. 252. Southey, in the 'Letters from England,' published near the beginning of the century, under the pseudonyme of Don Manuel Espriella, has an interesting chapter on the advent of the Addington Administration, in which he attributes the resignation of Mr. Pitt and his colleagues exclusively to the Catholic question. He adds: — "That this is the real state of the case, I have been assured on such authority that I cannot entertain the slightest doubt." (Letter 12. vol. i.)

such idea can be traced to any authentic source; it is clear that Mr. Pitt conceived himself bound by his previous conduct to press the question upon the King; that he would gladly, if he had been able, have overcome the King's opposition; that he resigned reluctantly; and that after his resignation, he would have resumed office if Mr. Addington had withdrawn voluntarily in order to facilitate his return. Lord Grenville's confidential letter to his brother, written before the resignation had taken place, and describing the plan as formed by Mr. Pitt and himself*, is decisive as to the real grounds upon which the Ministers acted. There is also in the Castlereagh Correspondence, a paper by Lord Castlereagh, containing a statement of the reasons for the retirement of Mr. Pitt and his friends from office. These reasons are threefold. 1. Their conviction that such a comprehensive measure is necessary in order to enable the empire to reap all the benefits of the Union. 2. The expectations of support held out by them to the Irish Catholics, whose support was in consequence given to the Union. 3. The improbability that a postponement of the question would mitigate the King's opposition.† In this full statement there is no allusion to any other ground for Mr. Pitt's resignation.

Lord Loughborough's conduct is more easily explained. The idea about the coronation oath had taken possession of the King's mind so early as 1795; he had then consulted Lord Kenyon and Lord Loughborough himself upon it.‡ It was

* Buckingham Papers, vol. iii. p. 128. The King, in a letter to Mr. Addington of Feb. 13. 1801, says: 'I think I am right (though it appears most extraordinary) that Lords C—— and C—— and Mr. C—— are the persons that led Mr. Pitt to the rash step he has taken.' (*Life of Lord Sidmouth*, vol. i. p. 305.) The persons here signified are Lords Cornwallis and Castlereagh, and Mr. Canning. We doubt the correctness of the King's supposition.

† *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Castlereagh*, vol. iv. p. 34. We have heard a report, which we hope may prove true, that there is a prospect of Lord Cornwallis's papers being given to the world, under the auspices of a very competent editor, closely connected with his family.

‡ The correspondence between George III. and Lord Kenyon, C. J., was published by his son Lord Kenyon, in 1827. Lord Loughborough, in his paper above referred to, says:—'In 1795, by his Majesty's express command, I delivered my written answers to some questions he was pleased to put to me upon this subject, which answers fell so short of the high sense of the obligation his Majesty felt to be imposed upon him, that they were rather displeasing to him.' (*Lord Campbell's Lives of the Chancellors*, vol. vi. p. 326.) Lord Malmesbury has the following entry in his 'Diary,'

known to the Cabinet in the autumn of 1799 (as we learn from Lord Castlereagh's letter to Mr. Pitt, cited above), that the King was then adverse to the admission of Catholics to Parliament and office. Lord Loughborough had indeed concurred with his colleagues in approving of this measure before the Union was passed; but finding from his conversations with the King at Weymouth that His Majesty still retained strong feelings on the subject, he changed his course, and opposed the measure, doubtless with no other motive than that of ingratiating himself with the King and strengthening his own position. As to the exclusion or admission of Catholics he was probably quite indifferent; and he had no intention of turning out Mr. Pitt's Government if it was to endanger his own tenure of the Great Seal. When the fate of the Government was announced, he was, we are told, 'all consternation'; he placed himself in Mr. Addington's hands, and was ready to accept the office of President of the Council, which the new Minister destined for him.* The King, however, who doubtless had not forgotten Lord Loughborough's conduct during the Regency, was not so easily conciliated as his late Chancellor had flattered himself. Lord Loughborough was mercilessly excluded from the new administration; and when the King, upon his resignation, delivered the Great Seal to Lord Eldon, he drew it from under the left breast of his coat, where he had carefully lodged it, saying, that 'he gave it to him from his heart.'† That the King distrusted Lord Loughborough—notwithstanding his attempts to gain the royal favour—as much as he loved Lord Eldon, is proved by his well-known exclamation on hearing of Lord Loughborough's death, that 'he had not left behind him a greater knave in the king's dominions.'‡

Feb. 26. 1801:—King at Windsor about the 6th or 7th instant; 'read his coronation oath to his family, asked them whether they understood it, and added, "If I violate it I am no longer legal sovereign of this country, but it falls to the House of Savoy."' It is very likely that this danger had been artfully suggested to the King. A passionate exclamation of the King at the same time, after having caused his coronation oath to be read to him, that 'he would rather beg his bread from door to door throughout Europe than consent to any such measure,' is reported by General Garth (*Pel-
leu's Life of Lord Sidmouth*, *ibid.* p. 235.)

* *Pellev's Life of Lord Sidmouth*, vol. i. p. 312. 315.

† Twiss, *Life of Lord Eldon*, vol. i. p. 251.

‡ The copy of a paper delivered to Mr. Pitt in 1795 by the King, with a memorandum in the King's writing, dated April 12. 1801, which was found among Lord Loughborough's papers, must have

As soon as Mr. Fox is informed of the hands to which the King had entrusted the formation of a new Administration, he writes to Lord Holland: 'Addington, Chancellor of the Exchequer, as against Pitt! If I do believe it, it must be *quia incompréhensible*.' The pure Tory Administration which was now formed does not support the theory to which we have adverted above, as to the anti-aristocratic tendencies of the Tory party. The Cabinet consisted of nine persons, five of whom were peers. The four commoners were Mr. Addington himself, together with Lord Hobart, Lord Hawkesbury, and Lord Lewisham, all eldest sons of Earls. But before the arrangements could be completed an unforeseen obstacle arose. The King's mind had been so much affected by the late ministerial crisis, that the necessity for a Regency seemed imminent, and his life was even in danger. In a short time, however, this cloud passed away; and after an unsuccessful attempt on the part of Mr. Pitt's friends to restore him to office, in which the conduct of this statesman does not appear to advantage, the 'Doctor' (as he was now universally called) commenced his inglorious ministerial career.

The publications of the Duke of Buckingham and Lord Holland contain much authentic information respecting events subsequent to the close of Mr. Pitt's first administration. The limits of an Article have, however, been already exceeded; and the completion of the 'Memoirs of Fox' may afford us an opportunity of reverting to the first decad of this century.

been given him by the King when he had his audience to surrender the Great Seal. (*Lord Campbell*, *ibid.* p. 300.) It is dated two days previously.

- ART. II.—1. *The Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare, the Text carefully revised, with Notes.* By SAMUEL WELLER SINGER, Esq. 10 vols. 12mo. London: 1856.
2. *Shaksper's Werke, herausgegeben und erklärt.* Von DR. NICOLAUS DELIUS. 1st vol. (Tragedies). Elberfeld: 1855.
3. *Notes and Emendations to the Text of Shakespeare's Plays, from early MS. Corrections in a Copy of the Folio, 1632, in the Possession of J. Payne Collier, Esq., F.S.A.* Second Edition. 8vo. London: 1853.
4. *The Plays of Shakespeare, the Text regulated by the Old Copies, and by the recently discovered Folio of 1632, containing early MS. Emendations.* Edited by J. PAYNE COLLIER, Esq., F.S.A. 8vo. London: 1853.
5. *The Text of Shakespeare vindicated from the Interpolations and Corruptions advocated by John Payne Collier, Esq., in his Notes and Emendations.* By SAMUEL WELLER SINGER, Esq. 8vo. London: 1853.
6. *A Few Notes on Shakespeare: with occasional Remarks on the Emendations of the MS. Corrector in Mr. Collier's Copy of the Folio, 1632.* By the Rev. ALEXANDER DYCE. 8vo. London: 1853.

WE have hitherto abstained from noticing a controversy which has excited no common interest, and stirred up no small quantity of literary bile—that occasioned by the appearance of Mr. Collier's 'Notes and Emendations.' We have persevered in this abstinence until the immediate pressure of the subject may seem to have passed away. Mr. Singer's new edition has, however, to a certain extent, revived it; and, for our own purpose, the comparative calm into which the strife has subsided is rather advantageous, that purpose being neither to defend nor to impugn, with any dogmatic positiveness, the authority of Mr. Collier's mysterious Corrector, but to endeavour, if possible, to limit the controversy within some general principles of criticism, instead of leaving it to be carried on in single-handed contests about the merits of separate passages, like the battles in the Iliad: a mode which may amuse the lookers-on by its displays of individual dexterity, but which forwards in no degree the conclusion of the war.

In fact, we expect but little towards the ultimate elucidation of the question from any of the present combatants. They are familiarly known by their exertions in the field of criticism; but theirs is a bygone school of criticism. They are Peninsular

veterans, called to a Crimean campaign. Their life has been spent in the study of the poet on the old foundationless and uncertain system; the train of new ideas and principles of criticism which these Corrections, whether absolutely received or not, has introduced, is admitted into their minds unwillingly. Accustomed to deal with conjectures only, upholding or upsetting them, none of them all—and this is peculiarly true of Mr. Singer—seems thoroughly to realise the generic difference between a conjecture, however happy, and a change which rests on presumptive evidence of authenticity, however slight. Mr. Collier, after having been inclined at first to regard his Corrector as an absolute authority, now candidly admits that he no longer holds that opinion; he professes himself inclined to believe that this mysterious personage amended the text before him partly on authority, and partly on conjecture: a supposition certainly allowable in the absence of evidence, but which appears, to say the least of it, unlikely—for it is difficult to conceive a man, with real materials before him, adding guesswork of his own—and for which we cannot find that Mr. Collier has given any reason. As for Mr. Dyce, he has the additional disqualification of a wisdom which has too manifestly entangled itself in overwiseness. His learning in the literature of Shakspeare's and earlier ages is most various and remarkable. His power of applying it seems to us very inadequate. His arguments are constructed with a great apparatus of parallel words and passages; but, instead of demolishing the opponent, they leave him unhurt, because they are almost invariably directed amiss. We need but instance the curious passage at p. 128. of the 'Few Notes,' in which, in order to prove the important fact that Shakspeare *might* have written 'cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff' (instead of *grief*, as written by the Corrector), he accumulates thirty-three instances of verbal iteration from contemporary authors, and thereby establishes, as far as he can, the very opposite conclusion; inasmuch as, in every one of these thirty-three specimens, there is some point, jingle, or antithesis, such as the taste of the times loved; whereas, in the received line of Shakspeare, there is nothing but flat repetition, which all writers, in all languages, avoid where they can by a kind of instinct.

That Mr. Dyce's forthcoming edition will impart to us much curious and some new antiquarian learning we have no doubt; we question much whether it will add to our real knowledge of Shakspeare any more than Mr. Halliwell's magnificent folio, which rejoices the eye, but afford no solace whatever to the mind. The truth is that a new school of Shaksperian criti-

cism is required; that the materials now accumulated by so strange an accident deserve, and will produce, men capable of dealing with them in a far broader and more liberal way than the present race of verbal commentators and parallel-passage compilers. For our own part, we have no pretensions whatever to anticipate the discoveries which future reasoners will probably make; but we are anxious to point out, in a few words as the subject will admit of, certain general views to which a comparison between the writings of the supporters and opponents of Mr. Collier's *Corrector* may probably direct the impartial inquirer.

If we were told by some scholiast of ancient days, that Aristarchus the critic, while wandering in the market-place of Alexandria with his head full of Homer, had purchased a bargain of figs, and, on returning home, found them wrapt up in a papyrus containing the genuine text of the poet, we should smile at the simplicity of the myth; and yet the romance of Mr. Collier's discovery is almost as marvellous. That gentleman is known to many of our readers as one who has devoted great part of his life to the study and elucidation of our great dramatist. By the merest accident, which might equally have occurred to any chance person, he became the purchaser of a copy of the second folio of Shakspeare (1632), which contained numerous MS. annotations. There was nothing remarkable in its exterior. One R. Perkins has inscribed his name, as owner, in durable characters on the old sheepskin cover. A certain Mr. Parry has recognised it as once his own, and lost many years ago: since which time it seems to have undergone the discipline of some servants' hall, where it was the fashion to 'read through Shikspur of an evening,' as proposed by the lady's maid in *High Life Below Stairs*: soiled with beer and tobacco stains and candle-snuff burns, and its dilapidated leaves scarcely holding together. Annotated copies of the folios are, it seems, common enough; and this one did not attract Mr. Collier's attention until a considerable time after the purchase, when he was surprised at the great number and remarkable character of the annotations.

'The singularity and interest of the volume arise out of the fact, that from the first page to the last, it contains notes and emendations in a handwriting not much later than when it came from the press.'

Without adverting to sundry known mistakes of pagination, it may be said that the entire volume consists of nearly 900 pages, divided into thirty-six plays: and, besides the correction of literal and verbal errors, as well as lapses of a graver and more extensive kind,

the punctuation has been carefully set right throughout. As there is no page without from ten to thirty of these minor emendations, they do not, in the whole, fall short of 20,000. Most of them have, of course, been introduced in modern editions, since the plain meaning of a passage often contradicts the old careless and absurd pointing; but it will be seen hereafter, that not in a few instances the sense of the poet has thus been cleared in a way that has not been anticipated. . . .

'Corrections only have been hitherto spoken of: but there are at least two other very peculiar features in the volume. Many passages, in nearly all the plays, are struck out with a pen, as if for the purpose of shortening the performance. . . . To this fact we may add, that hundreds of stage-directions have been inscribed in manuscript, as if for the guidance and instruction of actors, in order that no mistake might be made in what is usually denominated stage-business. It is well known that in this respect the old printed copies are very deficient; and sometimes the written additions of this kind seem even more frequent and more explicit than might be thought necessary.' (*Introduction*, p. xi. xviii.)

Such is Mr. Collier's own account of this very remarkable discovery, which we have carefully separated, for the present, from his speculations on the value and extent of it.

Now, when we thus read of a volume alleged to contain upwards of 20,000 cotemporary emendations of an avowedly most corrupt text; when we are told that the great majority of these corrections are of the simplest and most obvious kind (punctuations, slight transpositions, changes of easily mistaken letters, and the like); that many more of them anticipate the conjectures, not of one, but of many ingenious critics and passionate admirers of the poet; that many more, though new, are all but self-evidently right; that many disclose corruptions where none were suspected, or remove corruptions which none had ventured to touch; that many more (and this is a most remarkable point in the argument) are corrections where no corrections are required, substitutions of one word for another as good, or nearly so; when it is found that these most numerous and curious alterations are accompanied by a complete series of stage directions, singularly valuable in some instances, and everywhere bearing the appearance of theatrical traditions of the time immediately succeeding Shakspeare's: the first question which occurs must needs be, Can this mass of emendations be simply conjectural—simply the production of the leisure hours and ingenious brain of some long deceased possessor of the volume?

Certainly it is contrary to all ordinary and *a priori* probability that this should be so. We doubt if any similar instance can be found on record. Men do not sit down in cold blood to

cut up, and transpose, and alter from beginning to end the text of a most popular author; only recently dead, in mere wantonness. If a critic were to take so singular a fancy, it is certain he would confine himself to passages which needed setting right, and passages which he thought he could improve—he would not alter, by hundreds, minute words where no change was needed, and the rejected would make sense as well as the admitted. It would be more passing strange if such a critic had anticipated in numerous instances the approved conjectures of his ablest successors—still more so, if he proved capable, in many instances, of gilding the refined gold by adding new point to the wit and new depth to the pathos of Shakspeare.

Now,*before reverting more at large to the proof of these allegations, what we are anxious to establish is this: Let it once be conceded that *all* the annotations of Mr. Collier's Corrector are not conjectural, and consequences follow so wide that it is no wonder the present race of critics have shrunk from them. For whatever is not conjectural must be authentic. There is, as will be obvious on reflection, no middle supposition possible. It follows, therefore, that either *à priori* evidence deceives us in a most remarkable and unique manner, or we have now before us *some part* of the genuine text of Shakspeare. *What part* that may be—how far the Corrector is reliable—this may be matter of painful and anxious inquiry; it may admit, in the present state of our knowledge, of no safe solution: for the present we take our stand on the simple argument, that if all is not conjectural, then some must be authentic.

What the Corrector's mechanical *modus operandi* may have been, is of course a very important question in connexion with the former one; but we must leave those who are curious on the subject to trace it for themselves from the materials afforded by Mr. Collier. It has been conjectured, that he corrected *only* from the tradition of the stage preserved by actors of Shakspeare's time—from prompters' books—or from some documents of a more valuable and authentic nature. All these suppositions we leave for the present*, intending to revert to some of them again, when we have cleared the ground by exhibiting

* We may, however, notice here one remarkable indication, which we do not think Mr. Collier has observed. On inspection of the book, it will be seen that a very large proportion of the corrections are made, not by striking out one word and substituting another, but by striking through the erroneous *letters* only, and substituting the proposed ones in the margin, in the same manner as corrections of the press are usually made. This we take to be a strong sign of work done by transcribing, and not by the ear or by conjecture.

in a more distinct manner the reasons which go to disprove the supposition of mere conjecture. To do this, it is necessary that we should travel over ground familiar, perhaps, to many of our readers, — the history of the early editions of Shakspeare's plays.

Half of these appeared during his lifetime, singly, in quarto editions — editions full of manifest error, and, as we are assured by Shakspeare's fellow actors, Heminge and Condell, merely surreptitious. The great dramatist himself took no steps whatever to prepare his plays for printing; he left his manuscripts with his associates, and buried himself in his Stratford acres, with an apathy which

'Were it wisdom, coldness, or deep pride,'

has something of the awful in it, when we reflect on the gigantic fame of the man and the real nothingness of fame. In 1623, seven years after his death, the possessors of these manuscripts, the aforesaid Heminge and Condell, brought out the first folio edition of his plays; professing to follow implicitly the MSS., which, according to their statement, were so clearly written as scarcely to admit of mistake. And yet, with such materials as these before them, it is well known how disgracefully they executed their task. Of its importance to the world they could not be aware; but their duty to their deceased friend enjoined at least a decent performance of it. Nothing more vividly brings before us the inferior nature and breeding of the associates with whom Shakspeare's working days were past, than the preface to this volume: the 'smart writing' of the address to the public at the outset, almost as vulgar as smart writing in the days of Victoria; the fulsome eulogies on their departed comrade; the puff and quackery of the promise which they hold out, contrasted with the scandalous failure of the performance. It is plain that the folio was never 'edited' at all, in any reasonable sense. It is plain that notwithstanding the flourish about exclusively using the manuscripts of Shakspeare, the compilers did in fact often simply copy the quartos which they vilified. We cannot, therefore, feel any certainty as to the integrity of the text in other parts, where we have no quartos to collate. As for the typography, it is a chaos. To borrow the animated description of a foreign contemporary of ours, 'glaring typographical errors abound: verse is printed as prose, and prose as verse; the punctuation throughout seems to have been made at haphazard; words are omitted, mistaken, and transposed; and sometimes the types appear to have

‘been jumbled together into what bears hardly the semblance of a word.’ These errors are often of such a strange description, that it has become a question whether they were chiefly committed by the eye or the ear—whether the compositor misread the manuscript, or was misled by a careless reader—probably there is something of both. Now the reader must observe that the *pâté* thus forcibly but most truly described is *Shakspeare*; there is no other. Of most classical authors, even those with corrupt texts, there are several manuscripts which afford profitable collation: of Shakspeare there is nothing whatever having the semblance of authenticity, except this single and most unhappy edition.

For the second folio, 1632, adds nothing substantial to our knowledge. At one time a kind of rally was made in its favour, it is difficult to say why, by some Shaksperian critics; but Sanchez’s saying concerning preachers, *nil tam absurdè dici potest quod non dicitur ab aliquo prædicatorum*, is at least equally true of these gentlemen. Others have averred, on the contrary, that it bears no trace whatever of editorial labour, and that if the compositor has corrected some obvious mistakes, he has introduced quite as many. Mr. Collier, who judges it most favourably among the moderns, says (in his *Proposals* for a new edition of Shakspeare) ‘It was not a mere reprint, left to the mercy of compositors; but some editorial care was exercised in the production of considerable portions of it. Although the supervisor might, possibly, have resorted to then existing MSS., I do not think it probable he did so, nor do I perceive sufficient evidence in his emendations they would in that case discover.’ One curious theory is suggested by Mr. Halliwell, we know not how truly, viz., that some few of the emendations of the edition of 1632 are made with a view to modernise the language—so rapid was the change in our tongue in the generation succeeding Shakspeare’s.

Of the later folios nothing need be said. They are reprints only, with the addition of some doubtful plays.

Such being the history of the text of Shakspeare, it is no matter of surprise that as soon as critical attention began to be directed towards him, it took the form of sweeping and unlicensed conjectural emendation. In fact, there was plain justification for this course. No one is tied to a text self-evidently corrupt. The imagination refuses to be bound by any such restriction. It is plain that much, which is set down as Shakspeare’s in the folio, cannot be his in that shape. It is therefore probable, in all fair reasoning, that a great deal more is not his in that shape. These positions, once established, seemed to give

ample and undeniable scope for such ingenuity. In one sense, there was justice even in Dr. Newton's sweeping observation (in his preface to Milton), 'As the best guesser was the best diviner, so he may be said in some measure to be the best editor of Shakspeare.' 'The folio reads "Prenzie,"' says surly Johnson, speaking of a passage we shall by and bye notice, 'of which the second folio makes "princely," and Theobald "priestly," and every one else may make what he can.' On this simple principle most Shaksperian critics have acted. But as time went on, a marked change took place in the style of such conjectural criticism. The earlier editors—Theobald, Pope, Hammer, and the rest, down at least to Johnson—did not possess accurate verbal learning, nor pretended to it. Whatever they may have occasionally professed, it is clear that their real notion was, not to affect to discover what Shakspeare actually wrote, but to *remake* Shakspeare—to supply his defects, or rather those of his editors, out of their own stores. It is only the more refined, perhaps more elderly and effete style of criticism of a later day (beginning, we may say, with Steevens and Malone, and ending for the present with Mr. Singer, who adopts deliberately the same useless course), which has professed to conjecture, by the application of parallel learning, what Shakspeare might actually have written: and which rejects all attempt to purify his text unless it be shown, not that the change commends itself to our taste, but that authority by comparison may be found for it in the poet himself or in contemporary writers. Our ancestors amended Shakspeare as the bold artists of the sixteenth century 'restored' classical works—moderns patch him up as we now restore Gothic churches, stone for stone and beam for beam. The latter course is, in a certain sense, the more justifiable of the two; but it has degenerated into a most wearisome exercise of minute ingenuity. We need only refer our readers to the volumes at the head of this article for proof. Every critic, who ventures far in it appears to lose at once his character for judgment, and his temper and good manners: and, we speak it advisedly, but must leave our readers to verify the assertion—the result is absolutely nothing. Not one step is gained towards the real restoration of Shakspeare's text by the hundred conjectures, some plausible but many more utterly worthless, of the several writers now before us, and the many anonymous critics who have embarked in the present controversy. We may now and then think we see for a moment a light thrown on an obscure passage—generally to return, on farther thought, into its original darkness: but nowhere do we obtain anything approaching to satis-

factory assurance, that Shakspeare actually wrote what his conjectural amenders set down for him.

No conjectural emendation ought to be admitted bodily into the text of Shakspeare. If any such must be of necessity adopted as a substitute for the mere nonsense of the folio, it should be, in all careful editions, with some mark to denote its illegitimacy; a rule, simple as it is, which no modern editor seems sufficiently conscientious to adopt. It was, however, a sense of the wild and unprofitable length to which the guessers had run, which produced a few years ago the very opposite sect whom we may term the Foliantists—men who stood by the first folio through sense and nonsense, believed that orthodoxy lay in literal adherence to Heminge and Condell, as the Varius and Tucca of their deceased friend, and ransacked cartloads of contemporary trash to discover any possible analogy, which might justify retaining some hopeless typographical imbroglio as sense and poetry. Mr. Charles Knight we take to be the representative of this sect: Mr. Collier owns that he at one time belonged to it, but found it necessary to abandon it: and he did wisely. To attempt to set up the first folio in this way was, in effect, to turn a rule of convenience into a principle of faith. It is one thing to say that the most convenient course is to abide by the first folio, wherever bare sense can be made of it, as against all unauthorised conjecture, and another to say we are bound to believe it; to which no Inquisition can force us: for where an edition is obviously corrupt in countless places, it is, to a moral certainty, corrupt also in many more where the defect is not so obvious.

If, therefore, any strange discovery were to restore to us the original manuscripts of Shakspeare's plays—those 'papers' in which, Heminge and Condell assure us, they 'scarce received' from him a blot—we may, probably, assume that we should arrive at the following results.

We should, in the first place, find instantaneous and complete light thrown on many lines and passages which in their present state are mere *opprobria criticorum*—knots which no wit can unloose, and which have only been very clumsily cut by the use of conjecture. And we should, no doubt, be often surprised at finding at how slight an expense of words, syllables, and punctuation, the necessary change was effected.

Next, we should probably find an infinite number of slight verbal differences from the printed (and thoroughly corrupt) text. Many of these would be such as would appear to us, if presented on conjecture only, wholly unnecessary. For it is unreasonable to suppose that the typography of the first folio

never 'blundered into sense'—that nothing is wrong in it except what is unintelligible. Many passages, in it, which will pass muster as English, must nevertheless, on a fair calculation of probabilities, not be what Shakspeare wrote. Now these slight uncalled-for alterations are, for obvious reasons, quite out of the line of mere conjectural critics.

Again, a very great number of the rectifications established by such a manuscript would undoubtedly be of plain typographical errors; oversights, of which the origin would be clear on comparison of the MS. with the impression; omissions of lines and parts of lines, slips of the ear and of the eye, confusions of *idem sonantia*, changes of one letter into another very similar to it in the current hand, and the like. Here, again, the true Shakspeare would correct the folio (if such an expression can be used) in a manner very different from his ordinary commentators: for this last class of error is one which the latter (obviously) are least likely to divine, and least qualified to set right.

But yet further: it is probable, if we would but weigh the *à priori* evidence honestly, that many things would occur to us in the genuine Shakspeare which would disappoint us exceedingly. It is not only that we might not unfrequently find some slight changes rather worsening than bettering the text in our opinion. Shakspeare, who never blotted a line (would he had blotted a thousand, said Ben Jonson), must often have written with extreme carelessness, and even the most blundering compositor might here and there have improved him. But we should probably lose much to which we are really attached. Shakspeare, no doubt, often used harsh, obscure, far-fetched words and phrases; his surpassing imagination sometimes outran his power of composition; and he was often misled into obscurity from other and baser reasons, by seeking after points and quips to please the taste of the times: but *when we know we are dealing with a most corrupt text*, it is scarcely possible but that a vast number of these quaint, bold, or forced expressions, even though within the boundaries of the intelligible, are in reality typographical errors. We do not know, whether in severe logic, we ought not to go further, and venture to lay down the canon, that wherever the folio uses a forced word or phrase in lieu of a common one, there is an *à priori* probability of such error. Now it is curious to observe how many of the passages of Shakspeare which are the most quoted and best remembered, are marked with some special divergence from the ordinary and obvious mode of expression, and are all the better remembered on that account; just

as some peculiarity of accent or manner will keep alive attention to a speaker, when an irreproachably correct voice and action would send us to sleep. Such passages, therefore, become enshrined in a kind of superstitious attachment: *consuetudo*, as the philosophical poet has it, *concinнат amorem*. Men applaud them, much in the same way as we have observed a cultivated audience, at the Westminster Play, regularly bestow their loudest clappings on those texts of Terence which happen to be incorporated in their early friend, the Eton Latin Grammar. To inquire further into the origin of such inherited admiration would be an act of heretical boldness; for the profound apophthegm holds true in this as in weightier matters, that 'Time kills Reason.'

Lastly: Inasmuch as, after all, some very considerable intellectual powers, as well as poetical taste, have been applied for two centuries to the conjectural emendation of the text, it is probable that we should find a not inconsiderable number of later conjectures verified by the manuscript of the author himself; and this would be especially the case with those of the earlier critics; who were on the whole the ablest, the most unprejudiced even from their deficiency in minute learning, and had the advantage of coming first, and therefore of making the easiest guesses.

Now it will be our endeavour to lay before the reader such evidence as we can of the manner in which the corrections in Mr. Collier's folio answer this *a priori* conception of a really genuine text, according to the foregoing classification. We shall do so as nearly as we can by strict induction of probabilities, and not by the more pleasant, but less trustworthy, method of æsthetic criticism on the intrinsic merit of the corrections: and even should we depart from this rule of abstinence, we entreat the reader to regard this as done only by way of digression. If he wishes, on the contrary, to judge by the most unsatisfactory criterion of mere likings and dislikings, he will find plenty of company in the volumes before us. We shall for convenience confine ourselves almost wholly to instances from two plays—'Measure for Measure' and 'Twelfth Night'—selected at hazard, except in so far as that both appeared for the first time in the folio, and we therefore are not obliged to embarrass ourselves by collation with any other edition.

1. Corrections restoring the sense of entire passages.

The student of 'Measure for Measure' in the first folio, eager to realise the assurance of its editors, that the perfect text of the great poet is here laid before him, finds himself at

the very outset knee-deep in the following slough of despond, which we give *verbatim, literatim, et punctuatim*, as it appears in that edition :

(Act i. scene 1. *The Duke to Angelo.*)

'Of Governement, the properties to unfold,
Would seeme in me t' affect speech and discourse,
Since I am put to know, that your own Science
Exceedes (in that) the lists of all advice
My strength can give you ; Then no more remains
But that, to your sufficiency, as your worth is able,
And let them worke ;'

We spare the conjectural critics, and omit, in mercy, all notice of their ineffectual attempts to flounder through this mass of misprints. Let us now take the passage from the Corrector :

'Since I am *apt* to know, that your own science
Exceeds, in that, the lists of all advice
My strength can give you ; Then, no more remains
But *add* to your sufficiency your worth,
And let them work.'

Now the whole change is here effected by the slight alteration of two words, the omission of one, and the omission, also, of the two obviously redundant at the end of the sixth line. It is this kind of amendment, at small expense, which peculiarly distinguishes the authoritative from the conjectural restorer.

'She is fast my wife,
Save that we doe the *denunciation* lacke
Of outward Order. This we came not to,
Only for *propagation* of a Dowre
Remaining in the Coffer of her friends.' (Act i. sc. 3.)

Read, with the Corrector, '*pronunciation*' and '*procuration* ;' unless you think, with Mr. Singer, that 'no change of the text 'is necessary !'.

We pass to a remarkable passage, which has been the subject of as much bad criticism and rash restoration as any in Shakspeare. We give it again exactly in the shape in which the sinful Heminge and Condell tendered it to the world :

'*Claudio*. The Prenzie, Angelo?
Isab. Oh 'tis the cunning liverie of hell,
The damnest body to invest, and cover
In prenzie gardes ;' (Act iii. sc. 1.)

The second folio gave '*princely*' for '*prenzie*' ; Warburton conjectured '*priestly*' ; Tieck, very ingeniously, '*precise*' ('Lord Angelo is precise') ; Mr. Singer, '*pritzie* !' while frantic

Foliantists repudiated all change, and asserted that *prenzie* meant the Italian 'prente' in the first line, and we know not what in the last. The Corrector supports Warburton; but 'he also alters the last word, which no one had ventured to touch, although (notwithstanding the critics) as arrant nonsense as the other—and that by the change of a letter :

‘The *priestly* Angelo?’

Oh 'tis the cunning livery of Hell,
The damn'dest body to invest and cover
In *priestly* garb.

‘Priestly’ appears as superior to ‘precise’ in poetry and metre, as to ‘princely’ in sense. Lord Angelo was no more ‘princely’ than Chief Justice Coke or Lord Keeper Puckering. But he was very ‘priestly’; that is, according to Shakspeare’s familiar use of this class of adjectives, priest-like. And it is the priestly garb which deceives by the show of ascetic virtue; not the princely.

In ‘Twelfth Night,’ Sebastian thus describes his sister Viola (in the first folio):

‘A Lady sir, though it was said shee much resembled me, was yet of many accounted beautifull: but thogh I could not with such estimable wonder over-farre beleieve that, yet thus farre I will boldly publish her, she bore a minde that envy could not but call faire.’ (Act ii. sc. 1.)

The Corrector simply reads,

‘though I could not with self-estimation wander so far to believe that.’

A change which is all the more probable, because, while it makes sense of the passage, it does not make all smooth, as a mere conjecturer would probably have done. We refer the reader, however, in all fairness, to Mr. Singer’s remarks (‘Vindication,’ p. 64.), which seem to us more than usually appropriate.

‘It was she

First told me thou wast mad: *then* cam'st in smiling,
And in such forms which here were *presuppos'd*
Upon thee in the letter.’ (Act v. sc. 1.)

The Corrector reads ‘thou’ and ‘preimposed’; and thus reduces no meaning to meaning by the slight rectification of two misprints, the last of which was never suspected before, obvious as it is.

Now we beg the reader to observe, that we have by no means exhausted the list of corrections of this high order in the two plays before us; that these must be multiplied by the whole

number of the dramas; that he must reflect how much of wit, and learning, and poetical acuteness, have been devoted for nearly two centuries to the task of rectifying the text, and what an infinitely small amount of really satisfactory conjectural emendation, in really difficult passages, has been the result; and apply these data to the problem, whether it is possible that the author of the corrections before us worked by conjecture alone.

2. Slight verbal changes. The importance of these, as bearing on the question of the Corrector's authority, rests on their extraordinary number and their *general* effectiveness. It is impossible to give any satisfactory notion of them within limits such as ours; but, by way of specimen, the reader may, if he will, verify the few following from 'Measure for Measure':—Act ii. sc. 1., 'day' for 'bay'; sc. 3., 'serve' for 'seek'; sc. 4., 'force' for 'loss.' Act. iii. sc. 1., 'blessed' for 'boasted,' 'chief' for 'cheap.' Act iv. sc. 1., 'base' for 'these'; sc. 2., 'resisting' for 'unsisting'; sc. 3., 'confined' for 'combined'; sc. 4., 'such' for 'of.' Act. v. sc. 1., 'incredulity' for 'inequality,' 'truth' for 'trust,' 'reject' for 'retort.' In general, it will be found, that of this class of corrections some are all but self-evidently right, some throw a new light on the passage, some are improvements, though not needed; while many more are so wholly immaterial, that it is difficult to conceive any reason for their insertion, except an honest desire to produce a pure text from the materials before the Corrector. Any supposition is more probable than that resorted to of necessity by Mr. Collier's opponents—mere love of change, for change's sake.

3. Typographical corrections. In 'Measure for Measure,' the most remarkable instances of this sort which have fallen under our notice are some additions of lost words.

A well-known passage stands in the folio thus :

'In time the rod
More mock'd than fear'd : so our decrees
Dead to infliction,' &c. (Act i. sc. 4.)

Pope amended the sense and metre by conjecturing 'Be-comes more mock'd,' which has been admitted into the text ever since. The Corrector reads :

'In time the rod's
More mock'd, than fear'd : so our *most just* decrees.'

Minute as the difference may be, we cannot help remarking, how much less likely an error of the press, whether by a slip of the eye or ear, it would be to drop the first word of a line, than to drop two short ones in the middle.

'You have paid the heavens your function, and the prisoner the very debt of your calling.' (Act iii. sc. 2.)

The Corrector reads, 'You have paid the heavens *the due* of your function;' an addition at once unnecessary, very acceptable, and very improbable as a conjecture.

We pass to a far more remarkable emendation of this order.

Sir To. Come on—there is sixpence for you; let's have a song.

Sir An. There's a testril for me too: if one knight give a
-way sixpence, so will I give another: go to, a song.

Clo. Would you have a love-song, or a song of fair life?

(*Twelfth Night*, Act ii. sc. 3.)

The line in italics is added by the Corrector. We need scarcely intimate the trouble which the mutilated text has given the critics; or how far every one of them, we believe, has been from guessing that a line had *dropt through*. And yet, how self-evident the change appears when suggested; and what incredible boldness of conception, as well as neatness of execution, such an alteration *on conjecture* would evidence.* Were we inclined to rest the Corrector's reputation for authority on any single passage, there is none we would sooner fix on. Mr. Singer's objection, as he must needs object, simply is, that the Corrector, being a guesser, ought not to have guessed so boldly—which is only one instance in a hundred of his practice of taking the point in issue for granted—and he proceeds to insinuate a most innocent conjecture of his own (p. 174.); which he has not been ashamed again to propose in his new edition of the plays, without even noticing the Corrector's line at all!

The reduction to sense of a well-known puzzle in Fabian's speech, Act ii. sc. 5., by substituting 'by th' eares' for 'with ears,' we place in this class, because a little consideration will render its *typographical* probability so evident.

Another passage in the same scene gives, perhaps, a little insight into the corrector's mode of proceeding.

'And with what wing the stallion checks at it,'

says the folio: nonsense, in the ordinary meaning of the word stallion. Hammer conjectured 'stanyel,' said to mean a 'kite'; and his conjecture has been received: there is, however, some reason to suspect that the words were written and pronounced

* It is a proof how even the most careful eyes will occasionally wander in this kind of investigation, that Mr. Collier speaks of the second line as 'cut short by a hyphen in the early impressions.' There is no hyphen in the first folio. It is a conjectural addition of the typographer of the second, who noted the break-off in the sense.

interchangeably in those days of loose orthography. Our Corrector writes 'falcon'; which hardly could have been Shakspeare's; but is it not likely that a marginal note intended to *explain* to cockney playgoers Shakspeare's sporting word, may have been copied, mistakenly, by the Corrector from the original before him (whatever that was) as a *correction*? We are not supporting his infallibility, and shall revert presently to the very important question, whether his handiwork does not comprise *different classes* of correction.

Mr. Collier in his preface to his last edition gives us the following extract of a letter from a 'practical printer' regarding this class of emendations:—

'The volume you have recently published, interesting as it must be to all connected with literature, is peculiarly so to those who, like myself, find their daily occupation in the correction of typographical errors. The process by which these errors have been perpetrated is in most cases perfectly familiar to us by our hourly experience, and could be paralleled from the *first proofs* of almost any printing office in London. So natural are the emendations, so perfectly printer-like are the errors, that those who know best the defective state of typography three centuries since, can have no doubt as to the authenticity of the corrections.' (P. ix.)

4. Disappointing corrections.

'How would you be,
If he, which is the *top* of judgment, should
But judge you as you are?'

(*Measure for Measure*, Act ii. sc. 2.)

The Corrector has 'God of judgment'—to the dissatisfaction, probably, of most readers; the received text commending itself to the poetical sense, even without the aid of Mr. Dyce's fine parallel passage from Dante. But, prejudice apart, is not the commoner word the more probable one? Nor is the new reading without its propriety. Isabella is calling an earthly judge before the supposed tribunal of One whose special attribute it is to be the 'God of judgment.'

'Unfit to live or die! O gravel heart!' (Act iv. sc. 3.)

The Corrector reads 'grovelling beast'; and, without judging by the inadmissible test of mere likes and dislikes, we doubt the correction. It reads modern. The word 'grovel' occurs nowhere in Shakspeare's plays, except in the second part of Henry VI., which is probably not all his: and there only in the literal, not figurative sense. Yet, on the other hand, the *typographical* probability of the correction seems so great (the par-

ticipial termination in 'grovelling' would in cramped, or hasty writing, have been represented by a mere sign), that we must leave it to the decision of those who, in Lord Melbourne's phrase, are more cock-sure of everything than ourselves—a quality in which Shaksperian critics are rarely deficient.

After all, however, instances of this class of correction are rare; much more so than we should for reasons already given have *à priori* expected; and to exemplify our meaning fully, we must go beyond the limits of the two plays we have selected.

Every one who has heard of the Corrector at all, must have known something of the raging controversy occasioned by his change in the famous line of Macbeth—

'Nor Heaven peep through the *blanket* of the dark,'

into 'blankness of the dark.' And almost every one, probably, will have joined in the shout of repudiation with which it has been welcomed.

'But, to think true,

Let's cast off prejudice, and think anew.'

Is not our affection for the existing reading chiefly founded on the mere circumstance of having heard it repeated and quoted until it has almost become part of ourselves? And yet is it not always repeated or quoted in a *burlesque* sense, showing its real unfitness for the place it occupies? unless, indeed, on the analogy suggested to us by one of the readiest wits as well as foremost punsters of our day, namely, that of 'sheet lightning?' But we are bound to notice, on the other side, the parallel passage from 'Cymbeline,' most acutely adduced by Dr. Delius, 'If Cæsar can hide the sun from us with a blanket,' &c. On the whole we are in doubt, and, if the question could be fairly argued on critical principles alone, should be forced to dismiss this famous emendation with a 'not proven.'

We hardly venture to touch the passage next before us, sacred as we are certain it is to every reader, if only from the delightful commentary of Charles Lamb. When Dogberry describes himself as 'a rich fellow enough, go to: and a fellow 'that ~~hath had losses~~, we all know the quaint comic significance which he and other critics have drawn from an expression at first sight out of place. The Corrector reads, 'a fellow that ~~hath had losses~~. Before we condemn him, let us here also think again. We enter very unwillingly into the domain of æsthetic criticism: but, after all, does the received reading appear free from objection in its place? The ostentation of past losses would seem rather more appropriate in one who is seeking

to varnish his present decay by the lustre of times gone by, than in one, like Dogberry, who is making a vulgar boast of present prosperity. And 'one who has had leases' was a pointed description of a wealthy churl, which would have been fully appreciated by an audience in Queen Elizabeth's reign. For many a fortune had been made by people in Dogberry's class, out of the common abuse of beneficial leases of church and corporation property; while—if such very minute criticism may be allowed—the words 'who has *had* leases' seem to point to the circumstance that, just about the time of Shakspeare's first familiarity with theatres (in 1586) the last 'disabling statute' had rendered the farther perpetration of such profitable jobs impossible.

'Antonio. Whether thou be'st he or no,
Or some enchanted trifle to abuse me,
As late I have been, I not know.'

(*Tempest*, Act v. sc. 1.)

The Corrector reads 'devil' for 'trifle'—and thereby exchanges, it would seem, a phrase in keeping with the poetical magic of Prospero's island for a mere commonplace. But let us reflect. If there is one quality that specially distinguishes Shakspeare in his more careful moods, it is the strict uniformity with which each character in a play is held to its own appropriate diction. Now, in the '*Tempest*,' it will be found a settled rule, to the best of our belief, that (omitting the supernatural personages) the sense of that peculiar atmosphere of quaint and ethereal magic which invests the island is felt, and expressed, by none but the higher-souled characters—those whose spirits might be supposed attuned to its perception—Prospero, Miranda, Ferdinand; Gonzalo. To the others—the 'men of sin'—all that surrounds them is but earthly, sensual, devilish. They perceive in the spells with which they are beset only the gross devilries on which the vulgar appetite of the author's time fed itself. To them Prospero is simply a wizard like Dr. Faustus, and his airy followers imps like the witch of Edmon-ton's. If the word 'trifle' were correctly placed in Antonio's mouth, we believe it would be a solitary instance to the contrary. And let us look more closely still. Antonio speaks of being abused 'as late I have been.' How had he been abused? By the apparition of Ariel and his suite, carrying off the unearthly banquet. For what did the King's party take their harpy visitors? Simply for 'devils.' Sebastian so addresses them—

'Come one fiend at a time,
I'll fight their legions o'er.'

So, with this recollection full in his mind, Antonio deems Prospero himself only another devil in disguise. As to Mr. Singer's contemptuous exclamation, 'think of an enchanted devil!' we do not understand it. We take an 'enchanted devil' to be simply a devil invested with a particular form by incantation—one of the commonest demonological notions.

But, after all, and to leave such dwelling on single instances, which tend rather to divert the mind from our main purpose—what right have we to set up our attachment for particular quaint or unusual phrases, against a *primâ facie* probability, once established, that a commoner phrase—more prosaic if you will—was really used? Must we not confess, if honest, that we should be equally disposed in our hearts to do battle to the death for other phrases in the received text *which are not Shakspeare's at all*? Poor Sir Andrew Aguecheek's crimson hose form as regular a stage tradition as Hamlet's inky suit; but it was not Shakspeare who encased his nether man in them; the words 'flame-coloured stock' are Pope's; the miserable folio only gives us 'dam'd coloured stock,' which the Corrector alters to 'dun-coloured.' Who has not been touched, between sadness and laughter, by the description of the dying Falstaff, 'his nose was as sharp as a pen, and a' babbled of green fields,' and who would not have stuck to this reading as to an article of faith, had it not been well known that it is a mere invention of Theobald's? The folio gives us merely 'and a Table of green fields,' which the Corrector alters to 'on a table of green frieze.'

5. Anticipations of later conjectural readings. The number of these is certainly very great. If it is accurately stated that 'anticipated conjectures form the greater bulk of the corrections' this estimate probably includes all slight changes of letters and punctuation. It seems, however, that a Transatlantic critic has calculated that out of 1303 of the Corrector's emendations, discussed in Mr. Collier's first publication, 173 had already been received into the text as satisfactory conjectures; and this reduced proportion is still a large one. We will not allow ourselves to do more than allude to the use Mr. Singer thinks proper to make of the circumstance in his 'Vindication'; hinting over and over again, what he does not choose directly to assert, that the corrections are in reality by a recent hand; that the public has been deceived by a gross forgery, and that Mr. Collier, to say the least of it, has lent himself with culpable facility to its dissemination. Charges like these (if Mr. Singer is in earnest) ought not to be suggested; they should be made directly and seriously. If we had found anything like a frank

retraction of them in the preface to his new edition, now that he has had two years to think on the matter, we would have spared all reference to the subject. But this is, unfortunately, not the case. There are only a few lines which look as if Mr. Singer meditated an apology for his violence, but had not self-command enough to utter it. For our own parts, we ask our readers to assume throughout the *genuineness* of Mr. Collier's discovery, and confine themselves to estimating its value.* On a very cursory examination of the 'Notes and Emendations' for this particular purpose, we find in the two plays now before us, five important conjectures of Theobald supported by the Corrector, for Theobald is the most acute of all the commentators, and after Pope the most poetical; two apiece of Pope, Hanmer, Tyrwhitt, Jackson; one apiece of Warburton, Coleridge, and Sir W. Davenant.

Will our readers pardon us if, before leaving this tempting inquiry into individual instances, we diverge for once from the path we have traced for ourselves, and indulge in the discussion of one or two remarkable emendations of the Corrector, which have perhaps hardly received the attention to which they are entitled?

Lear. Who are you?

Mine eyes are none of the best. I'll tell you straight.

Kent. If fortune brag of two she lov'd and lash'd,
One of them we behold.

Lear. This is a dull sight—Are you not Kent?

(*King Lear*, Act v. sc. 7.)

The Corrector reads 'a dull light.' Obviously, no such correction is *necessary*. A dull sight (a melancholy spectacle) will do well enough. The more improbable, therefore, that any mere guesser would have meddled with the passage. But how marvellous an addition to the picture is made by the substitution of that one letter! In this high-wrought scene, the poet is accumulating, one by one, the signs of advancing death on worn-out body and broken mind. One of the commonest of those signs is the delusion which makes the dying person imagine that the room is darkening, when in fact his own eyes are failing. Well was this known to one whom, even with Shak-

* It will hardly be believed by any one not familiar with the rancour stirred up by this strife, that, while these sheets are passing through the press, Mr. Collier has been forced into a court of justice to vindicate his character from the downright charge of literary forgery, brought against him by some anonymous assailant of Mr. Singer's mood. This beats Scioptius and Scaliger, Bentley and Boyle.

speare before us, we may place among the very first observers of the outward phenomena of humanity. Who does not remember the dying woman's exclamation in that terrible scene in the *Antiquary*, under the mingled illusion of failing eyesight and wandering brain—'Lights, lights, Teresa! *the grand staircase* 'is murek as a Yule midnight.'

It might seem no easy matter to improve the quarrel scene between Brutus and Cassius (*Julius Cæsar*, act iv. sc. 1.); but let us examine the effect of one slight correction.

'Cassius. I am a soldier, I;
Older in practice, abler than yourself
To make conditions.

* * * * *

Brutus. You say, you are a better soldier;
Let it appear so; make your vaunting true,
And it shall please me well. For mine own part,
I shall be glad to learn of noble men.

Cassius. You wrong me every way; you wrong me, Brutus:
I said an older soldier, not a better:
Did I say better?' .

The comparative tameness of the line in italics, in a passage in which every other word *tells*, cannot escape the reader; and yet (to use our former test) no correction is absolutely required, and we can scarcely imagine a mere guesser attempting one. The *Corrector*, however, by the change of a letter or two only, reads

'I shall be glad to learn of "*abler*" men.'

'Abler' was precisely the word which Cassius had used, and thereby stung the sensitiveness of Brutus. But Cassius, with the characteristic sophistry of hasty self-defence, passes by the word *abler* which he had used, to deny the word *better* which he had not used—'I said an older soldier, not a *better*.' The passage as thus amended seems to us complete—the unjust charge on the one side, followed by the equivocating denial on the other; the captious and unworthy word-fencing of the two noble opponents, under the irritation of their momentary estrangement.

One more we will add, which our readers will not find hitherto noticed in any publication; it is, in fact, a recent discovery in the Folio, which, from the paleness of the ink, and defaced state of many pages, has not even yet been thoroughly examined. It occurs in Timon's general invitation to the Athenians (Act v. sc. 3.)—

'Whoso please
To stop affliction, let him *take his haste*,

Come hither, ere my tree hath felt the axe,
And hang himself.

Not a single critic, so far as we know, has ever noticed the barbarism of the words italicised; all have been content to assume, *siccis pedibus*, that 'take his haste' was put for 'make haste' by what, in our school-construing days, we termed a 'poetical license,' although neither Shakspeare nor any one else ever employed such a phrase in any other instance. But the Corrector reads —

. . . . 'let him take his halter.'

Can this be a *guess*?

Such is the kind of evidence—we emphatically say the *kind* of evidence, for the truth is, that injustice is done to the argument by any selection of passages: it is their multitude which is irresistible—in favour of the position, that the work of Mr. Collier's Corrector is not wholly conjectural. This, we must once more repeat, is the real issue—not whether it is wholly authentic, which none can prove, and few who have considered the question will suppose. For if in part only authentic,—if we once establish that the Corrector has even partial authority,—every one of his readings, whether we like it or not, has a certain amount of *à priori* evidence in its favour; and no mere conjecture ought to be admitted to stand against such presumption.

But this is the conclusion—obvious as, we confess, it appears to ourselves—which has proved so very difficult of digestion to the whole race of conjectural critics, whose trade it discourages. Even Mr. Collier himself is at fault, as it seems to us, in estimating, we will not say the value of his discovery, but the proper mode of dealing with it. 'It is not to be understood,' he says in the Preface to his one-volume Shakspeare, 'that the editor approves of all the changes in the text of the plays contained in the ensuing volume: but while he is doubtful regarding some, and opposed to others, it is his deliberate opinion that the great majority of them assert a well-founded claim to a place in every future reprint of Shakspeare's dramatic works.' But if they possess any 'well-founded claim' it must be because they are presumably authentic; and if the great majority are presumably authentic, by what right does Mr. Collier make his selection, and say, because this or that change does not please myself, I therefore pronounce it unauthentic? It is the old fallacy of at once admitting authority, and then admitting private judgment to control it. But the case being thus even with Mr. Collier, it is easy to conceive

the amount of disfavour with which the Corrector has been received by Mr. Collier's critical brethren; a disfavour which has naturally had its effect on general readers, always very ready to suspect any new discovery, and apt to make it their first question whether any of the Pharisees have believed in it. We have given our readers but few specimens of the particular criticisms on passages in the corrections, which the volumes before us contain; for our own parts we have felt inclined to take the Corrector's part in the majority of instances; and we think we have noticed that each of his assailants, while infinitely preferring his own favourite reading to the Corrector's, generally prefers that of the Corrector to every one's else. But we confess that these criticisms have but little effect upon us, because the writers uniformly disregard the general view of the question, and confine themselves to bit-by-bit discussion, which can only end in hopeless and endless controversies of individual taste. Mr. Singer, however, is at least consistent in his view—to him the Corrector is either a mere guesser, or, more probably, an 'ingenious forger,' who has read all the editions of Shakspeare, borrowed all the best emendations, and spent endless time and labour in copying them into a printed volume in a feigned hand, along with many of his own—and all, by anticipation, in order to deceive any critic who might purchase such volume. If we have done Mr. Singer's theory wrong, we can only refer the reader to the Preface to his 'Vindication,' which we can understand in no other way. But what does the more candid, but far less logical Mr. Dyce mean by saying that 'Mr. Collier's volume will be useful to future editors, because, while it abounds with alterations ignorant, tasteless, and wanton, it also occasionally presents corrections which require no authority to recommend them, because *common sense* declares them to be right?' What has common sense, that is to say Mr. Dyce's opinion, or Mr. Collier's, or ours, to do with the matter? How could any mere mass of conjectures, however clever or ingenious, be 'useful to future editors of Shakspeare?' is it not Mr. Dyce's real meaning, though he does not like to express it, that he has little doubt that for *some part* of his readings the Corrector had authority?

Whatever opinion there may be as to the merits of the controversy, there can be none, unfortunately, as to the spirit in which it has been carried on. With fierce political and religious discussion raging around us, we turn to the quiet field of Shaksperian criticism in expectation of relief, and we find that arena occupied by combatants more fierce, more bitter, more given to evil speaking, slandering, and misconstruction of mo-

tive, than Parliament or Convocation. Such, we lament to say, is the tone which characterises not only some of the productions before us, but also those of other eminent critics in periodical publications, whose anonymous disguise we are bound to respect. But Mr. Singer, far above the rest, has contrived to write himself into a continuous and unmitigated wrath, which he vents in language of most unusual heartiness. As for the Corrector, whoever he was, doubtless 'nothing can touch him farther.'

'Ne fût-il mort que d'aujourd'hui
Il est aussi mort qu'Alexandre.'

And to compliment him with the epithets of an 'Oliver Martext' (Delius), an impertinent meddler, an intruder, over busy, ignorant, conceited, 'utterly incapable to enter the spirit of Shakspeare' (Singer), and fifty more such delicate phrases, is very harmless work. But what has Mr. Collier done to justify the misdirection of no small part of this abuse against himself? Of what has he been guilty, except the accidental finding of the volume which has provoked so much ill will? If his first exultation in its discovery made him rate its value somewhat higher than other critics might tolerate, he has surely since made amends for such exaggeration by subsiding into comparative scepticism. And he, at all events, has never departed from the fitting moderation of the gentleman or dignity of the scholar. He shrinks, even timidly, in his last Preface to the Notes and Emendations, 'from the Remarks, Observations, Criticisms, Vindications,' &c. 'which,' he says, 'I happen to know are in preparation.' 'I cannot well account,' he adds in a really touching passage, 'for the almost personal animosity with which, in some quarters, I have been already met, and with which I am threatened hereafter. My accidental discovery of the corrected folio, 1632, has, I fear, tended to cool friendships of long standing; and individuals with whom I was formerly acquainted now look upon me as if I had done them some injury, which they could not overlook, and yet did not know how to revenge. Some persons complain that I am too dogmatical in my criticisms; others that I am too bold in my speculations; a third party thinks that I have not done justice to earlier editors; and a fourth (which I apprehend is the greatest grievance of all), that I have unfairly abridged the field for future speculation.' Our readers may judge to what height party feeling has run, when they are told that even the gentle editor of 'Notes and Queries' has found it necessary to rebuke 'the tendency of too many of our contributors (on this subject) to depart from the

‘courteous spirit by which the earlier communications to this ‘journal were distinguished.’ Strange to say, the contagion of the fever has spread to sedate Germany, where Dr. Delius bewails the tendency of the Collier-combatants, ‘nicht überall ‘die wünschenswerthe Urbanität und Manierlichkeit in ihrer ‘Polemik zu beobachten.’*

But enough of this ungrateful topic: we turn to what is more essential. It may be asked, if there is reason for attributing so high a value to some portion of the Corrector’s labours, what is the reason for rejecting any? why may we not assume, what certainly seems *à priori* the probable conclusion, that if he had authority for any part he had it for all, and we have now under our eyes the genuine text of Shakspeare? We will endeavour to answer the question, not by doubts and surmises as to particular instances, but on general grounds.

1. Though the Corrector clears up many obscure passages, he leaves untouched many others quite as dark. Several of the best-known puzzles for critics continue unsolved. Cassio (to take one instance out of many) still remains ‘a fellow almost ‘damned in a fair wife,’ although it is all but certain he had no wife, and although, if he had, there is not another word in the play alluding to her beauty or his consequent damnation. It seems clear, therefore, that the Corrector had not before him materials for complete emendation. And in some places he has been caught in the fact. There is a passage in Troilus and Cressida (Act v. sc. 3., ‘O be persuaded,’ &c.) which in the folios is clearly a ‘nonsensical jumble.’ The baffled Cor-

* Shakspeare is cosmopolitan, and becomes more so as the world advances. In Germany Mr. Collier’s discovery has excited almost as much attention as in England. Dr. Delius, the compiler of the ‘Shakspeare-Lexicon,’ and of the elaborate edition of the plays now in progress, opposes its authority: Tycho Mommsen has defended it in an Essay, which we have not been so fortunate as to meet with. But New Englanders must not in this respect be classed as foreigners. They may almost contend that they have even a greater part in Shakspeare than ourselves — since their ancestors left our shores in the time immediately following his, and must have carried away with them, all Puritan as most of them were, the very echoes of the voice of the popular poet. By far the best and most thoroughly reasoned discussion of our present subject with which we have met, is contained in the North American Review for last year. Though we do not entirely adopt the writer’s conclusions, yet, in much that we have had to say, we have unavoidably gone over the same ground with himself. But we must disclaim having borrowed opinions which were our own before we met with them in his pages.

rector has simply struck out three lines; proving, says Mr. Singer, that he had 'no access to better authority than we possess.' True, in this instance; but Mr. Singer omits to add, that the same circumstance raises the strongest possible presumption that he was not a guesser. For, if he had been, he would assuredly have tried his hand on this passage as well as on so many hundred others. The safer conclusion is, that, like Goethe's fiend,

'All knowing he was not: much knowing certainly.'

Mr. Collier has noticed that the two heraldic lines in Helena's beautiful address to Hermia, 'Is all the counsel that we two have shared,' &c., are similarly scored through by the Corrector, probably because, like most other readers, he did not understand them, and thought that audiences would be in the same condition.' It may be so; but no one would regret their loss. See also an instance from Henry the Fourth, part 1. act ii. sc. 4., in 'Notes and Emendations,' p. 233.

2. Mr. Collier has informed us of the remarkable fact, that the corrections do not appear to have been all made at the same time, though all, in his opinion, by the same hand. The Corrector had gone over his work twice, at least. Now this admits of more than one possible solution. He might have acted thus from mere carefulness; he might have done so from collation of different MSS.; he might have done so for distinct purposes, as we shall see presently. A careful and critical examination of the book, such as we look for one day from Mr. Collier, may throw some light on the question; but, any how, an unavoidable shade of doubt is left in the mind.

3. But we must refer our readers to Mr. Collier's own volume for conclusive proof of a circumstance already alluded to, much more important than these collateral points: which is, that the main object of the Corrector clearly was, to amend his folio so as to adapt the plays for the stage. It is an ingenious, and not improbable, supposition, that this was a labour of love, undertaken during the forced idleness of the theatres under Puritan rule (1642-60). That, in the Corrector's mind, it was one essential part of this adaptation to restore the authentic text as far as he could, we have no doubt; but this was not the whole. He has also struck out whole passages, speeches, and scenes; some with a view to shortening for representation; some on account of their grossness, or for other reasons. One remarkable instance will show the nature of this process of double amendment for distinct purposes. The play of Hamlet

is made to end with the two lines spoken by Horatio over the prince's body—but, inasmuch as the eternal fitness of things seemed to the Corrector to require that a tragedy should conclude with a couplet, they are thus altered

'There crack'd a noble heart. Good night, *be blest,*
And flights of angels sing thee to thy rest.'

Then follows 'Finis.' Then another couplet, evidently a 'tag' introduced by some actor; and the remainder of the play is scored through; *but under this scoring the corrections of the text are continued.* The Corrector was, therefore, carrying on two processes at once. This being the case, it appears a formidable task, if not a hopeless one, to disentangle these separate operations; to say of each amendment, whether its purpose be critical or theatrical. It is, above all, difficult to resist the conclusion, that many of the Corrector's changes—who can say how many?—have been made with the view of modernising his author, and thereby rendering him more acceptable on the stage. For much of Shakspeare's diction, we know, was already antiquated in the next generation.

On the whole, we are strongly attracted towards an hypothesis which we have already indicated: That the Corrector had under his eyes large portions of the authentic text of Shakspeare, in what shape it is impossible to say: That he transcribed from his mysterious original in the most painstaking manner, and with general accuracy, but still with occasional slips, deviations, and misconceptions: That he went over his work again, at a different time or times, in the spirit, not of a critic, but of a playwright adapting for the theatre. These suppositions would go far towards accounting for the puzzling phenomena of Mr. Collier's folio; but they are suppositions only, and as such we leave them to our readers. If they be true, or approach the truth, then it follows that the text of the Corrector must be in future received *primâ facie* as that of the Dramatist. The burden will be thrown, in each instance, on those who contest it. Still, such contests will be legitimate. No 'end of controversy' has been established. We have acquired an additional guide, but we are unable to say how far he is a safe one. We have a new authority, which we dare not disregard, and yet dare not implicitly follow. We have a new and strong preservative against the temptation to conjectural criticism; and yet we feel that there is much still unelucidated, and therefore left open to the barren license of conjecture. Some of these perplexities may, possibly, be removed by more careful

and thorough collation; nor is it altogether hopeless that old MS. corrections of other copies of the folio—now that general attention has been called to the subject—may bring out some additional truth. We confess, however, that we have as yet little faith in these alleged discoveries. We wait for proof of the value of Lord Ellesmere's first folio, and of the existence of that treasure which, according to Mr. Halliwell, Mr. Gayangos remembers to have seen, many years ago, at Valladolid—namely, an annotated copy of the same edition which had belonged to Gondomar! No doubt the imperfections of the folios led many purchasers of them to indulge in marginal correction; but, until any is found corrected in the same systematic, uniform, and very peculiar manner as Mr. Collier's, such partial discoveries rather tend by contrast to enhance the importance of his.*

We cannot conclude without remarking that notwithstanding all Mr. Collier's deserts in this matter, to which every candid reader will do ample justice, we almost regret that this remarkable instance of literary treasure-trove did not fall into less critical hands. Any one who was not himself a member of the commentating craft, would probably have dealt in a much simpler way with it. He would have given the world at once the whole body of the Corrector's annotations; so arranged as to make it clear where and how they departed from the original folio, and also from the commonly received text. This has not been Mr. Collier's course—the spirit of the conjectural amender was too strong within him—he could not relinquish with a good heart the amusement to which his life had been so much dedicated. He therefore first gave us his volume of Notes and Emendations, embodying, no doubt, most of the Corrector's important alterations, but only as excerpts from the text, and overlaid with a quantity of controversial matter, entertaining and valuable in itself, but too much diverting the attention from the really important issue before it. Secondly, he has given us a single-volume edition of Shakspeare, as altered by the Corrector, but without note or comment of any kind, to show where the alterations are; so that the reader has the impracticable task imposed upon him of comparing it line by line, for himself, with the first folio or with ordinary editions. So that, by a singular infelicity, neither the one work nor the other, nor both together, give us what we really want—the means whereby

* We observe already in the programme of Messrs. Leigh and Sotheby's sales for this year, a copy of the first folio, 'annotated by 'one who had seen Shakspeare and his fellow-actors!'

we may carefully and conscientiously estimate for ourselves the value of the reformed text, without the encumbrance of modern matter. This is what the public, we must repeat, require at Mr. Collier's hands; and until he gives it, most people will continue to doubt the value of his treasure, and some its reality. And if he is waiting until he can give at the same time a new edition of the plays after the received critical fashion, which no man, we admit, can better execute—furbishing up or recasting old conjectures, inventing new ones, controverting those of others, and adding to the over-strained ingenuity of the hunters after parallel passages, until the work of his manuscript Corrector bears to this supererogatory labour the proportion of Falstaff's bread to his sack,—we feel that a long time will yet have to pass before anything like an accurate conclusion is arrived at on a subject so interesting to the lovers of our great poet.

ART. III.—1. Σπυρίδωνος Τρικουπή Ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἐπαναστάσεως. Τόμοι Α' καὶ Β'. Ἐν Λονδίῳ: 1853-4. [*A History of the Greek Insurrection.* By SPIRIDION TRICOUPI. Vols. I. and II. London: 1853-4.]

2. *History of the Byzantine and Greek Empires, from 716 to 1453.* By GEORGE FINLAY. Two vols. Edinburgh and London: 1854.

3. *Greece and the Greeks of the present day.* By EDMOND ABOUT. Translated by authority. Edinburgh: 1855.

4. *Travels in Albania and other Provinces of Turkey in 1809 and 1810.* By the Right Honourable Lord BROUGHTON, G.C.B. A new edition, 2 vols. 8vo. 1855.

5. *Examen du Quatrième Point de Garantie.* Par G. A. MANO. Paris: 1856.

THE republication of Lord Broughton's instructive and agreeable volumes carries us back for more than forty years—to the time when the independence of Greece was still a distant dream, when 'Childe Harold' and the 'Giaour' were still unsung, and when Lord Byron and Mr. Hobhouse took rank with the most adventurous travellers of their time. Tourists, scholars, and politicians have since rendered the regions which they explored familiar to every reader, and some of the chief public questions of the world are now agitated in lands then scarcely visited. But we have hardly any book in the language which contains more just and lively appreciation of modern manners in eastern

Europe, or more scholar-like criticism on the remains of the past. The notes added to this edition have considerably enhanced the value of the original journal in this latter respect, and it well deserves to command the interest of a second and a third generation of readers.

To ourselves this interest is heightened by the recollection of the singular contrast and revulsion which may be traced between the feelings excited in Europe by the cause of Greece soon after this book was written and the feelings with which the cause of Greece is commonly regarded at the present time. From 1820 to 1830 the emancipation of the Greeks from the Turkish yoke was passionately desired by every man whose heart beat for freedom, civilisation, and Christianity. In that brilliant period of our political and literary annals, Greece was the perpetual theme of the poet's enthusiasm and the statesman's eloquence. It was for Greece that Byron died and that Church and Codrington fought. The heroic efforts of the Greek people maintained the contest single-handed for many years, against an overwhelming superiority of forces directed against them with unsparing ferocity; and never was the sacred cause of national independence more nobly defended. At length the irresistible power of their moral rights, backed by the universal sympathy of mankind, awakened even the torpid cabinets of Europe. Prince Metternich still consistently opposed the policy of Greek emancipation, and the Duke of Wellington described as 'untoward' that victory of the allied fleets which disarmed the Egyptian in the harbour of Navarino. But the treaty of London secured the existence of the Hellenic people: thenceforth they ranked again among the nations of the earth; and the powers which had ratified this victory endeavoured to promote the welfare of the new State by their protection, their counsels, and their loans.

It cannot for a moment be denied that very great mistakes were on all sides committed. A miserable contest of foreign factions succeeded to the glorious warfare of emancipation. A people just springing into new political life, and still tinged with many of the vices of their long slavery and their lawless freedom, were consigned to an inexperienced sovereign and a Bavarian Regency. The loans were wasted by jobbers, and a long series of disappointments, intrigues, and quarrels has ensued from the first year of King Otho's reign to the present time. The last result of this lamentable state of things is that in the course of the war in which we have been engaged since 1854, the sympathies of the Greek race have been to a considerable extent alienated from the Western Powers and transferred to their

common enemy, and that, throughout Western Europe, the Greeks are now as vehemently decried as they were once enthusiastically applauded. There was exaggeration in that applause, for the Greeks had always great faults; there is injustice in this hatred and contumely, for the Greeks have still great qualities and a national future. Nor is the sympathy which prevails in Greece for Russia altogether unaccountable; for it is based on the hostility of Russia to their ancient oppressors, and on the connexion of Russia with the strongest and most permanent of their institutions—the Greek Church. The Greeks look to Russia simply as the Power which is most likely to promote their own national policy and interests. But however repugnant those interests may appear at the present moment to be to our own alliance with the Porte, and to the objects of the war, the Western Powers have to deal with the fact that the Greek race not only form a State under their special protection, but also people the islands and cities of the Levant; that this race is rapidly increasing in wealth, intelligence, and power, whilst its former oppressors are sinking into decrepitude; that it is immeasurably superior to the Mussulman and Slavonic subjects of the Ottoman Empire in ability and in ambition; and that, whether for good or for evil, the Greeks must continue to exercise a most important influence over the affairs of the East. No part of the conditions of peace recently tendered to Russia is of greater moment than the article which provides for the future condition of the Christian races in Turkey: none is of equal difficulty, for on the political condition of those races depend the tranquillity or disorder, the government or the dissolution, of the Empire itself. There lie the future destinies of the East; and such is the importance we attach to this subject, that we propose to enter more fully than we have yet done upon the past history and present state of modern Greece.

Whatever view be taken of the character and future prospects of the Greeks, this much is certain, — that to exchange Turkish for Russian dominion would be madness. To exchange an old, worn-out tyranny for a young and vigorous one, is a piece of folly censured long ago in an ancient apologue of Stesichorus about a fox and a hedgehog. The ardent wish of the Hellenic mind is to see an independent Grecian Emperor seated on the throne of Constantine, an independent Grecian Patriarch ministering within the gorgeous temple of Justinian. A more extended view, which takes in the Bulgarian and the Wallach as well as the Greek, might prefer to see the imperial city become the *Ægium* or *Washington* of a great south-eastern federation. But it should never be forgotten

that either plan was alike forbidden by the late Emperor of all the Russias. Sir Hamilton Seymour's despatches testify that the imperial projects allowed of no confederation of republics, no extended kingdom of Greece, no Byzantine Empire. Within the Greek kingdom, popular opinion is hostile to Turkey. But popular opinion does not desire absorption in the Russian Empire. Such, at all events, is not the desire either of the people or of its most enlightened leaders. As neither Leonidas nor Demosthenes, Nicephorus nor Basil, so neither Μavrokordato nor Kanaris would agree to purchase material prosperity at the price of national existence.

'La Russie,' says M. Mano, whose testimony is above suspicion, 'n'est pas un peuple libre, et quiconque parmi les nationalités opprimées cherchera dans son appui l'indépendance, ne pourra être soupçonné de penser à se ranger sous sa loi. Si les Grecs ont pu chercher dans la puissance Russe un instrument de leur émancipation, c'est toujours en donnant des gages à la liberté.'

Another objection sometimes made to the Greeks, as a ground why we should bestow no kind of sympathy upon them, is that the modern Greeks are mere impostors, not Greeks at all. Absurd as this objection is, it deserves a little consideration, because it is a sort of appropriate punishment for the narrow grounds on which the cause of Greek independence was set forth by many both Hellenes and Philhellenes. There has been a vast deal too much talk about the descendants of Leonidas and Themistocles, about the glories of Marathon and Thermopylæ. Both the Greeks and their friends were too apt to leap back a couple of thousand years, and to ignore all history between the fight of Chæronea and the fight of Drageshan. They were too apt also to isolate the cause of the Greek from the general cause of subject nations. The real grounds for sympathy with the Greeks are that they were an oppressed people rising against their oppressors, and a Christian people, oppressed as Christians, rising against infidel oppressors. The immortal associations of old Greece, the identity of language, and in many respects of character, between its ancient and its modern inhabitants, added of course a peculiar charm which could not attach to any other land or any other struggle; but the real merits of the Greek cause, — the cause of religion, liberty, and civilisation, — must not be overshadowed by past associations, however glorious. It is not because they breathed the same air, and spoke the same tongue, as Æschylus and Epaminondas; but because they were fighting for their liberty and their religion, that the sympathy of Christian Europe was given to

the men who restored to independence the ancient birthplace of freedom and civilisation.

Undoubtedly, if no one but a genuine Hellene can claim our sympathy, and if no one is to be admitted as a genuine Hellene who cannot produce a pure Dorian or Ionian pedigree, we may as well give up the cause at once. The modern Greeks are a very mixed race; though not more mixed than the modern English. If Macedonian, Slavonian, Albanian, Wallachian, Frankish, and even Turkish blood is mingled with the pure stock of the old Hellene, so is that of the old Anglo-Saxon mixed up with the blood of every race which he conquered and of every race which conquered him, with that of every people whom commerce or persecution have led to establish themselves in our island. Gael, Cymry, Dane, Norman, Fleming, Frank, almost every nation of modern Europe, have contributed to the result. Yet we generally rather boast ourselves of our mingled ancestry; while the mingled ancestry of the Greek is supposed to make him an unworthy mongrel, incapable of comprehending what national sentiments are. If the Greek is a mongrel, so is the Englishman; but the Englishman, after all foreign intermixture, remains essentially and practically an Englishman, and the Greek, after all foreign intermixture, remains essentially and practically a Greek.

We must here explain exactly what we mean by the word Greek, as it is used in at least three different senses.

We do not mean merely the subjects of the Greek kingdom; we do not mean to include all Turkish Ravahs in communion with the Greek or 'Orthodox' church. By Greeks we mean all those, without regard to political allegiance or geographical position, who at once speak the Greek language and profess the Greek religion. The present extent of the Greek nation, thus defined, may be best seen in the map prefixed to Professor Max Müller's *Languages of the Seat of War*. It answers very nearly to that of the Byzantine empire under the Comneni, though its limits are not quite so extensive. That is, it includes a great majority of the inhabitants of the Greek kingdom, of the Ionian islands, of the Turkish provinces of Epirus and Thessaly, of the maritime parts of Macedonia and Thrace, of Crete, Cyprus, and the other islands subject to the Sultan, together with a narrow strip of the Asiatic coast from Sinope almost to Tarsus, and some outlying colonies in the Crimea and other parts of Southern Russia. Thus the Greek nation is divided between four different sovereign states, Greece, Turkey, Russia, and that most anomalous of governments, the United States of the Ionian Islands. Ethnologically this nation is of excessively mixed origin, but

the Hellenic element is probably the most extensive numerically, and it has in any case communicated its name, its language, and the most important feature of the national character.

Thus much for the ephemeral argument that the Greeks are partisans of Russia, and the absurd one that the modern Greeks are not exclusively of pure Hellenic blood. But, writers like M. About go on to tell us, — what indeed, if true, is very much more to the purpose, — that the Greeks are a race so utterly depraved as to be quite unworthy of sympathy, and that, since the emancipation of a small portion of the race, the new state has proved such a complete failure as to show that the nation is entirely unworthy and incapable of independence.

As to the Greek national character, we are ready to admit that it is defaced by many grievous faults, but it has its no less conspicuous excellences. It is, in short, both in its good and bad points, very much the same as that of the old Greeks, allowing for the debasement inseparable from the loss of political liberty for two thousand years, the last four centuries of which time have added the additional burden of the most grinding Mahomedan oppression. The mass of travellers, from various motives, are commonly led to describe the modern Greeks in the worst colours. The elder travellers sometimes passed them by altogether, thought the governing race alone worthy of attention, and regarded Turkey as exclusively the country of the Turks. Even Lord Broughton drew an unfavourable picture of the Greeks before the War of Independence. The merely classical school of travellers were more devoted to measuring temples and theatres than to studying the condition of the people: if they thought of them at all, it was enough to pronounce them utterly vile and base, if every unfortunate peasant, every ignorant priest, did not exhibit the valour of Brasidas and the wisdom of Solon. How Turkish Rayahs are likely to be depicted by the modern school of what Lord Carlisle happily calls Ottomaniacs, it is unnecessary to say. The truth may best be told in a few words from the venerable and illustrious Colonel Leake.

‘The Turks have a certain manly politeness, which is the most powerful of all modes of deceit, and which seldom fails in giving strangers an erroneous expression of their real character. It covers a rooted aversion to all European nations, as well as to the individuals who have the misfortune to have any dealings with these plausible barbarians. . . . To say that the Turks have more honour and honesty than their Christian subjects, is a poor commendation: they have not the same necessity for the

‘practice of fraud and falsehood. What other arms against their tyrants are left to the unfortunate Rayahs?’*

The Greeks, in fact, during their long slavery became what an extremely quick and clever people must become when reduced to bondage. The powers which, in a state of freedom, are consecrated to the highest objects, are necessarily, in the slave, diverted to the object of tricking and deluding his tyrant. And when habits of this sort are worked into the national character, it is too much to expect that they will never be employed against any but their tyrants, or that they will be at once reformed in a single generation by a change of outward circumstances. It is easy to draw a dark picture of the modern Greeks; it would be equally easy to draw as dark a one of the ancient Greeks. The Frenchman who told Lord Byron that the Greeks of his day were the same canaille that they were in the time of Themistocles, spoke consistently, and in a certain sense truly, from his own point of view. But those who profess to admire the ancient Greeks have no right to join in this unmitigated abuse of their descendants. The old Greek was brave, patriotic, intelligent, fond of political excitement, eager after knowledge, devout in the practice of his religion. So is the modern Greek also. But the old Greek quickness often degenerated into vanity and levity; patriotism was almost always attachment to a district, often only to a party; love of political excitement often led to a neglect of the proper ends of civil government; devotion was always akin to superstition, and often acquired the darker stain of persecution. Such is the case with the modern Greek also. Even the most glorious struggles of the revolution were tinged, we are told, by the party-spirit, the personal views, the selfishness and corruption of many of the Greek chiefs. They could not, even in that awful crisis, rise above petty and personal views. Neither could any Greek city, save Athens alone, in the awful crisis of the Persian war. A Greek, both then and now, found it difficult to resist temptations of personal aggrandisement, and could hardly ever keep his head from being turned by unexpected prosperity. Solon, Aristides, Pericles, Epaminondas, and Phocion, stand forth as marked exceptions. Themistocles, Gylippus, Miltiades himself, were not above personal corruption; Philip never lacked traitors in the Assembly; Pausanias aspired to the satrapy of Hellas; Alcibiades fought against his country; Alexander could not resist the flattery of those who proclaimed him as the son of Zeus. Yet these men are ranked, and rightly, among great men, heroes, and patriots.

* Travels in Northern Greece, vol. iii. p. 256.

It happens, in fact, that the very virtues and blessings of one state of things become the vices and curses of another. Greece and the Greeks were made for disunion, for local, party, and personal quarrels. But it was that disunion and those quarrels which made ancient Greece great and glorious. It was through them that she was enabled to present to the world the first examples of every form of political and intellectual life. Had Greece formed one united and orderly body politic, a limited monarchy, or a republic of the Roman kind, she would doubtless have preserved her independence longer, and might have enjoyed greater material prosperity while it lasted; but she would never have become the world's teacher in art, literature, and policy. The necessary evils of her spirit of division were amply counterbalanced by the higher life they kindled in her own time, by the lesson she has bequeathed to all time to come. The modern Greek, too, concentrates his attention on political and intellectual excitement; he has his legislative chamber, his free and active press, his elaborate system of jurisprudence, his improving city, his flourishing university. So far, so good; only let him also condescend to remember that some attention might not be unprofitably bestowed upon the tilth of the ground and upon the preservation of life and property.

That the Greek kingdom has in many respects failed, we fully admit; that its failure is partly owing to the Greeks themselves, we also fully admit. But in judging them we must not forget the enormous difficulties with which they were surrounded,—difficulties which might have upset any scheme, and which were fatal to the scheme actually adopted. And, after all, taking the present condition of the Greek kingdom on the showing of its bitterest enemies, we still unhesitatingly maintain these two propositions:—

First, that, after all deductions, liberated Greece has greatly benefited by her liberation.

Secondly, that those points in which the Greek kingdom has confessedly failed, are not altogether to be imputed to the Greek people.

To examine this last proposition, will involve a condensed history of the Greek people down to the outbreak of the revolution and through the course of the revolutionary war. And opportunely for our purpose, we have lying before us the two first volumes of the work in which the present Greek Minister in England, Spîridion Trikoupi, has undertaken to record, in the modern Greek tongue, for his own countrymen, the events of that great struggle which has again given to a portion of their

race a place among the nations. We look upon the appearance of such a work with a peculiar satisfaction; a real historian of contemporary events, using a language derived immediately from that of Thucydides and Polybius, is an event in literary history. In estimating the merits of Trikoupi's history we must remember that it belongs to the class of contemporary histories. He is a Greek recording for Greeks events which have occurred within his own memory, and in which he himself bore no inconsiderable part. To a foreigner he may sometimes appear too minute in his narrative, and to require too much antecedent knowledge of obscure places or persons; but this will always be the case with a history of this kind, and the effect must be widely different upon readers of his own people. His narrative is clear and vigorous; there are few or no attempts at rhetoric; but some striking or horrible events, such as the martyrdom of the Patriarch Gregory, draw forth fine bursts of natural and unaffected eloquence. We must add that, zealous Greek as he is, he strikes us as remarkably fair; his story obliges him to relate many evil deeds of Greeks and a few good ones of Turks; and he nowhere attempts to gloss over the crimes of his countrymen, or to depreciate the honour due to their enemies.

An English narrative of the same period may, we believe, ultimately be looked for from the hands of Mr. Finlay, though the volume which is announced as in the press will include only the history of the Ottoman and Venetian period. Nearly twenty years ago that distinguished philhellene appeared as the author of a small work entitled 'The Hellenic Kingdom and the Greek People,' which formed alike the most successful vindication of the Greek people and the severest censure of the Hellenic kingdom. Recently he has won more abiding literary fame as the author of the works which have so worthily asserted the claims of Constantinople and mediæval Greece to that place in the history of the world, which prejudice and ignorance had conspired to deny to them. Mr. Finlay brings to his task every historical excellence, except the power of graphic narration, in which he is certainly deficient. His learning is profound, and his judgment no less so; he has lived in the land and among the people of which he writes; sincerely devoted to their welfare, he is by no means blind to their faults. We shall look with impatience for the completion of Mr. Finlay's invaluable series. Till its concluding volume appears the English reader must supply its place by the sterling narrative of General Gordon, and by the third volume of Sir Archibald Alison's new history, which is in great part devoted to the Greek Revolution, and is one of the best productions of his lively but superficial pen.

We will now, with the help of these writers, of the work of Mr. Finlay, and those of some earlier authors*, attempt to give a sketch of the history and condition of the Greek nation down to the outbreak of the Greek Revolution.

The origin of the existing artificial Greek nation, as distinguished from the purely Hellenic race of classical antiquity, must be looked for in the earliest days of Hellenic colonisation. Greek settlements gradually spread themselves over all the coasts of the Mediterranean and the Euxine. In many cases they communicated their language and civilisation to their barbarian neighbours. In some cases, as in a large portion of the Ottoman Empire, countries which thus became Greek remain so to this day; in other cases, as in Sicily and Southern Italy, the Grecian character has disappeared. The conquests of Alexander extended the Greek language and civilisation far beyond the limits of the old Greek colonial system; and though in many parts their influence was but transient, yet large provinces of the Macedonian Empire became essentially and permanently hellenized. Finally, Greece was destined to avenge her subjection to Rome, by becoming herself the seat of the Roman power, and gradually hellenising her imperial masters. The seat of the Roman Government was fixed in a Greek city which claimed to itself the title of New Rome. The Latin and the Oriental provinces were gradually lopped away till the Roman Empire became very nearly coextensive with an artificial nation, speaking the Greek language and communicating with the Greek Church. Greek and Roman became convertible terms; the Empire of Constantinople was Roman in its political, Greek in its literary aspect. But Roman was the name always affected alike by sovereigns and subjects, and to this day 'Roman' still remains the formal designation of Turkish subjects of the Greek rite. In fact, during the whole duration of the Byzantine Empire, the name of Hellenes was positively avoided, not merely as derogatory to the majesty of the Roman Cæsar and the Roman people, but as implying fellowship with

* Colonel Leake it is almost unnecessary to name specially. His labours form the groundwork of all knowledge of Greece. Mr. Pashley's 'Travels in Crete' are almost equally valuable for that island. Sir J. E. Tennent's 'History of Modern Greece' is full of blunders in the Byzantine ages, but of considerable value for the times nearer the Revolution. Much also may be learned of matters both before and since that event, from the successive numbers of the 'Spectateur de l'Orient,' a very able Athenian journal, published in French.

race a place among the nations. We look upon the appearance of such a work with a peculiar satisfaction; a real historian of contemporary events, using a language derived immediately from that of Thucydides and Polybius, is an event in literary history. In estimating the merits of Trikoupi's history we must remember that it belongs to the class of contemporary histories. He is a Greek recording for Greeks events which have occurred within his own memory, and in which he himself bore no inconsiderable part. To a foreigner he may sometimes appear too minute in his narrative, and to require too much antecedent knowledge of obscure places or persons; but this will always be the case with a history of this kind, and the effect must be widely different upon readers of his own people. His narrative is clear and vigorous; there are few or no attempts at rhetoric; but some striking or horrible events, such as the martyrdom of the Patriarch Gregory, draw forth fine bursts of natural and unaffected eloquence. We must add that, zealous Greek as he is, he strikes us as remarkably fair; his story obliges him to relate many evil deeds of Greeks and a few good ones of Turks; and he nowhere attempts to gloss over the crimes of his countrymen, or to depreciate the honour due to their enemies.

An English narrative of the same period may, we believe, ultimately be looked for from the hands of Mr. Finlay, though the volume which is announced as in the press will include only the history of the Ottoman and Venetian period. Nearly twenty years ago that distinguished philhellene appeared as the author of a small work entitled 'The Hellenic Kingdom and the Greek People,' which formed alike the most successful vindication of the Greek people and the severest censure of the Hellenic kingdom. Recently he has won more abiding literary fame as the author of the works which have so worthily asserted the claims of Constantinople and mediæval Greece to that place in the history of the world, which prejudice and ignorance had conspired to deny to them. Mr. Finlay brings to his task every historical excellence, except the power of graphic narration, in which he is certainly deficient. His learning is profound, and his judgment no less so; he has lived in the land and among the people of which he writes; sincerely devoted to their welfare, he is by no means blind to their faults. We shall look with impatience for the completion of Mr. Finlay's invaluable series. Till its concluding volume appears the English reader must supply its place by the sterling narrative of General Gordon, and by the third volume of Sir Archibald Alison's new history, which is in great part devoted to the Greek Revolution, and is one of the best productions of his lively but superficial pen.

We will now, with the help of these writers, of the work of Mr. Finlay, and those of some earlier authors*, attempt to give a sketch of the history and condition of the Greek nation down to the outbreak of the Greek Revolution.

The origin of the existing artificial Greek nation, as distinguished from the purely Hellenic race of classical antiquity, must be looked for in the earliest days of Hellenic colonisation. Greek settlements gradually spread themselves over all the coasts of the Mediterranean and the Euxine. In many cases they communicated their language and civilisation to their barbarian neighbours. In some cases, as in a large portion of the Ottoman Empire, countries which thus became Greek remain so to this day; in other cases, as in Sicily and Southern Italy, the Grecian character has disappeared. The conquests of Alexander extended the Greek language and civilisation far beyond the limits of the old Greek colonial system; and though in many parts their influence was but transient, yet large provinces of the Macedonian Empire became essentially and permanently hellenized. Finally, Greece was destined to avenge her subjection to Rome, by becoming herself the seat of the Roman power, and gradually hellenising her imperial masters. The seat of the Roman Government was fixed in a Greek city which claimed to itself the title of New Rome. The Latin and the Oriental provinces were gradually lopped away till the Roman Empire became very nearly coextensive with an artificial nation, speaking the Greek language and communicating with the Greek Church. Greek and Roman became convertible terms; the Empire of Constantinople was Roman in its political, Greek in its literary aspect. But Roman was the name always affected alike by sovereigns and subjects, and to this day 'Roman' still remains the formal designation of Turkish subjects of the Greek rite. In fact, during the whole duration of the Byzantine Empire, the name of Hellenes was positively avoided, not merely as derogatory to the majesty of the Roman Caesar and the Roman people, but as implying fellowship with

* Colonel Leake it is almost unnecessary to name specially. His labours form the groundwork of all knowledge of Greece. Mr. Pashley's 'Travels in Crete' are almost equally valuable for that island. Sir J. E. Tennent's 'History of Modern Greece' is full of blunders in the Byzantine ages, but of considerable value for the times nearer the Revolution. Much also may be learned of matters both before and since that event, from the successive numbers of the 'Spectateur de l'Orient,' a very able Athenian journal, published in French.

the old idolatry of Hellas. But this nominally Roman people was practically Greek, even though so many of its mightiest sovereigns, from the earliest to the latest times, were in blood utterly alien alike to Greek and to Roman nationality. Princes of Slavonian or Armenian blood owned no title but that of Emperor of the Romans, while they often understood no tongue but that of Greece, and always held the Pontiff of old Rome for a barbarian schismatic, and the western Cæsar for a barbarian usurper.

The storm of Constantinople by the Franks and Venetians in 1204 put an end to the old Byzantine Empire, and the Greek people have never since either constituted a single state or obeyed a single master. They were divided among a multitude of lords, Greek and Frank, among whom the restored Emperor of Constantinople was only one of many. Most of them were but ephemeral powers, but one retained its prize with a firmer hold. The winged Lion of St. Mark grasped between his strong claws 'one fourth and one eighth of the Roman Empire.' While all the rest, Greek and Frank, were gradually swallowed up by the advancing tide of barbarian conquest, 'Europe's bulwark' 'gainst the Ottomite' still survived; sometimes losing, sometimes conquering, she still remained mistress of a considerable section of the Hellenic race, till she herself sank into subjection within the memory of living men.

At the death of Mahomet II. the Sultans were masters of the whole Greek mainland, except a few points held by Venice. In the course of the next century, Cyprus and the Ægean Islands were gathered in. The latter half of the seventeenth annexed Crete, and lost Peloponnesus; but that last of Venetian triumphs was owing to the untimely greatness of one man; and when Morosini was no more, when Austria proved faithless, the crescent was again planted upon the plain of Argos and the Acropolis of Corinth. Here and there, among the crags of Tænarus or of Souli, some semibarbarous tribe might preserve a wild and precarious independence; but, wherever there was anything which diplomatists would recognise as a 'government,' the representatives alike of old Greece and of old Rome found their 'sovereign' in a barbarian and infidel invader—the Padiſhah who wielded the sword of Othman and of Bajazet—the Caliph who represented upon earth the person of the Prophet of Arabia.

From this time forth no portion of the Greek nation possessed a national government; by far the greater portion sank below the condition of ordinary subjects, even of a foreign power; they became the *rayahs* of the Turk. Now this condition is not to be confounded with the ordinary relation of sub-

jects even towards a despotic sovereign. The Greeks and their companions in bondage did not merely become 'subjects' in a political sense to the Sultan of the Turks instead of to the Emperor of the Romans; the nation became in its own land subject to another nation. Two nations dwelt in the same country; one born to rule, the other to serve; one to bear arms, the other to remain defenceless; one to receive, the other to pay, custom and tribute. The first principles of a Mahometan government required that the tributary infidel, the *rayah*, should always remain in a condition of political and civil degradation. The payment of his *Kharatch* redeems indeed his life and property, procures him the free exercise of his religion, and puts him under the nominal protection of the law. But he still remains a member of a subject caste, forbidden any share in the government of his country, incapable of giving evidence in the court which may decide upon his life and fortune. Apostasy alone can put him on a level with his Moslem neighbour; while he adheres to his own faith, he is in no sense the fellow-citizen or fellow-subject of the professors of the dominant creed. The ruler of his land is not the head of his own people, but of strangers and invaders; his government can never inspire loyalty; it can only be obeyed through fear or sordid self-interest. Such has been the condition of the Christian subjects of the Porte for ages; and such it remained until the present day, when the increasing influence of the Christian Powers and the more tolerant disposition of Abdul Medjid have led to the admission of Christians to civil rights, long altogether withheld from them, and still conceded in theory rather than in practice.*

* Dr. Sandwith, in his most interesting and unaffected narrative of the siege of Kars, gives some striking examples of the very imperfect application in the provinces of Asia Minor of the more tolerant measures which have been recently decreed at Constantinople. Four centuries of arbitrary power and religious fanaticism are not overthrown in a day.

'While on this subject,' says the Doctor, 'I cannot do better than give an example of the way in which the feelings of this class of the Sultan's subjects are trampled on by Mussulman intolerance. Here is a faithful translation of a *teskere*, or permit of burial, given by the Cadi of Mardin in the spring of this year, 1855, to a Christian applying for it. He has given, and does give, scores of the like kind to all the *gizours* in his jurisdiction. Here it is:—

"We certify to the priest of the church of Mary that the impure, putrified, stinking carcass of Saideh, damned this day, may be concealed underground.

"EL SAID MOHAMED TAZI.

"A. H. 1271, Rejib 11. (March 29. A. D. 1855.)"

Yet the condition of the rayahs of Turkey varied much in different ages and in various parts of that enormous empire. At the breaking out of the Revolution, it included every condition from that of the Hydriot tributary enjoying complete local independence, to that of the Cretan whose life, property, and honour was not safe for a moment. Between these two extremes, the inhabitants of Northern Greece were generally better off than those of Crete, worse off than those of Peloponnesus. Favoured districts also occurred; Mount Athos was left to its saintly inhabitants, and Magnesia was hardly more troubled with the presence of Turks than Hydra itself. In Cyprus the imperial taxes were unusually heavy; but the relations between Turks and Christians in the island were unusually friendly.

To ascertain whether the condition of the rayahs at the time of the Revolution was better or worse than at the first conquest is less easy. It involves several considerations. First of all, we must observe that the Sultan himself as opposed to inferior governors may always be considered as a comparative friend of the rayah. Hence it follows that the greater the power of the Sultan, the better for the rayah. Now, the early sultans were mostly great men and great rulers; their government was vigorous, and, if stern — often cruel — it was far from being always unjust. They were men whose care extended itself over the whole compass of their dominions, and by no means tolerated anarchy and insubordination in their distant representatives. One cannot doubt but that the oppression of the rayahs was far less under Mahomet the Conqueror, or Amurath, or Solomon the Magnificent, than it was under the miserable successors of these great monarchs. Those detestable tyrants and voluptuaries, in whose character weakness and wickedness were combined, could not exercise the same control over their vast empire; their subjects were exposed to the exactions and insults of innumerable subordinate despots, and could no longer, with the same confidence, 'flee from petty tyrants to the throne.'

But while we cannot doubt but the mass of daily local oppression greatly increased under the later sultans, circumstances arose in other respects which tended to raise individual members of the rayah class to positions of importance and influence, which the first conquerors certainly never contemplated. One change, indeed was introduced in the seventeenth century, which improved their condition both directly and indirectly; up to that time the impost of the tribute-children continued to be levied. From this source the Porte had hitherto drawn not only its chosen warriors, but to a great extent its most trusted statesmen and

civil servants. But the Janissaries grew too strong for the enervated sultans of later days; they became an hereditary caste, their ranks were recruited from their own children, and the Christians were relieved from this dreadful tribute of their own flesh and blood. This was of course a relief common to all the subjects of the empire, but other causes arose specially tending to the political elevation, though certainly not to the moral improvement, of some classes of the Greeks. Just as the Turkish Sultans and the Turkish people were rapidly losing their old energy and their old position—possibly, indeed, because they were losing it—they were brought into more close contact with the nations of Christian Europe. By the close of the seventeenth century the Turks had ceased to dictate, and were compelled to negotiate, their treaties. Hence arose the necessity of a diplomatic class, which it was utterly impossible to supply from among the arrogant and bigoted Moslems of those times, ignorant of foreign languages, and despising the manners of foreign nations. Moreover, as the position and dignity of the Porte declined, the supply of Christian renegades in its service naturally declined also. The Sultans were driven to look to their Christian subjects for men who could cope on equal terms with the diplomatic agents of other powers. The subtile intellect and not overscrupulous honesty of the Phanariot Greeks supplied exactly the men for their purpose. The Prince of the True Believers was therefore represented in every foreign negotiation by a dog of an infidel, and a brother of the same despised race was obliged, as chief interpreter, to fill a position of high dignity at home.

About the same time, posts of still higher dignity became open to the same class of rayahs. The provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia became tributary to the Ottoman Porte in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries respectively. By the terms of their submission, they were to retain their own national governments, and to elect their own Princes, subject at most to the Sultan's confirmation. Christianity was to remain the religion of the country, indeed the settlement of Mahometans within its limits was strongly prohibited. These terms were neither much better nor much worse observed by Turkey than such agreements generally are between the weak and the strong. The Sultans gradually took to influencing the elections of the Princes, and finally to appointing and deposing them at pleasure. To have sent a Turkish Pasha might have been too gross a violation of the original engagement; so the office was committed to these same Phanariot Greeks. The person appointed, rich doubtless, and influential at home, but still, after all, one of a subject and degraded race, went down to his principality with

the state of a Byzantine Emperor, carried a hungry swarm of his countrymen with him, whom he decorated with titles of nobility and enriched with the highest offices in the province, till the strange spectacle arose of a race, slaves in their own land, converted into the rulers and oligarchs of a foreign country.

The opening of offices of this kind to the Greeks, and to the Greeks alone, among the subject races, doubtless conferred distinction on the whole people, and served to cherish the feeling of nationality. But it was thoroughly corrupting for all parties concerned, Greeks, Turks, and Wallachs. These Greek Princes, being at once slaves and tyrants, were placed in the most unfavourable position for the development of any virtuous principle. Rich and influential as they seemed, they were still, no less than the most miserable Cretan peasant, shut out from the highest earthly ambition, that of a share in the government of their own land. By cringing to a foreign master, by intriguing and bribing his ministers and favourites, they could obtain the right of representing him among foreigners, or of avenging their slavery upon slaves of their own. But the Greek ambassador of Turkey could not go forth with the honest wish of serving his own country; he appeared in other lands as the representative of one whom in his heart he cursed as an alien usurper. The Greek Prince of Wallachia had not obtained by honourable service an honourable place among his own people; he was sent to bear rule over strangers, by a master alike a stranger to both. The effect was, that intrigue and bribery ruled everything. The Prince won his place by corruption; as soon as he was gone, his fellows caballed and bribed to procure his recall. He meanwhile, knowing his precarious tenure*, set busily to work to extract from his temporary subjects the greatest amount of wealth in the shortest space of time. The government of such a prince, less sanguinary indeed than that of a pasha, was probably more extortionate, as he carried with him an equal will to extract contributions, and greater ingenuity in effecting his purpose. One or two of these rulers, indeed, did some good to the oppressed peasantry; many more followed the true Greek instinct in promoting education; but, generally, a viler system of government could not be devised. Such was the condition of those great Phanariot families who grew into a sort of hereditary aristocracy, and decked themselves with high-sounding, sometimes with imperial names. By a dexterous use of their wealth, they obtained vast influence even over those state affairs

* Latterly, Russia stipulated that no Prince should be arbitrarily deposed under seven years.

from all direct and honourable share in which they were debarred. High officers were appointed and deposed by their intrigues; indeed, the mutual corruption of Greeks and Turks reached such a height, that Christians frequently purchased of the heads of the Mahometan law, blank commissions for the office of Cadi, which they retailed at an advanced rate to true believers desirous of administering justice according to the precepts of the Prophet.

We have defined the Greek nation by the two marks of the Greek tongue and the Greek religion. We may add that the distinct existence of the Greek nation is, more than to any cause, due to the existence of the Greek Church.* In the East the ideas of nationality and religion are almost identified. The profession of the 'Orthodox' faith was the distinguishing badge of the Byzantine empire for the last six centuries of its existence. It was to those who held it instead of a nationality. Here was something to distinguish them at once from the schismatics of the West, and from the heretics of Syria and Egypt. So too in later days, under French, Venetian, and Ottoman bondage, religion and nationality have been identical in the Grecian mind. A Latin or a Moslem of the purest Hellenic blood ceases to identify himself with the Greek people. The Cretan Moslems, the most oppressive of all, were of Grecian origin; the Latins of Syros, throughout the war of Independence, openly sympathised with the infidels against the orthodox insurgents; it was by the hands of Christian Mirdites that Botzares met his glorious end. Both parties might have learned better from an example of former times. Constantine Palæologus died in communion with the old Rome, the willing martyr of subjects who shrank from him as a heretic. Mahomet II., a politician rather than a bigot, took advantage of this sectarian madness, and declared himself the protector of the Orthodox Church. The Orthodox duke Notaras preferred to see the Turkish turban within the walls of St. Sophia rather than the Papal tiara. He had his will and lost his head; but the Orthodox monk Gennadius survived to receive the crosier of the Patriarchate from the hands of the infidel

* 'On ne peut pas mettre en doute cependant que l'Eglise Orientale ainsi constituée, n'ait entretenu, n'ait aiguisé pour ainsi dire, chez la société Grecque, cet esprit de discussion et d'examen que le despotisme impérial tendait à détruire, cette tradition des *meetings* religieux et amour des débats publics, cette habitude de la parole, cette vie, en un mot, qui remplaçait, jusqu'à un certain point, les libertés publiques; et que, grâce à elle, la conquête Ottomane ne trouva pas dans les Grecs des esclaves énervés et inertes, prosternés devant un despote.' (*Le Spectateur de l'Orient*, p. 270.)

victor. The result was, that the Greek Church, while still remaining the centre of the national life, became a most convenient instrument of Turkish domination. The Patriarch and the sacred synod, regarded as the heads of the subject nation, were treated much after the same manner as the tributary princes. They were endowed, under the rule of the infidel, with greater authority than would have been allowed them by any Christian government; but they held it by the precarious tenure of servile submission to their masters on the part of themselves and of their flocks. High in wealth, honour, and power, the Greek prelates became too often the slaves of the Moslem, the tyrants of the Christian. The Patriarch, surrounded by a guard of Janissaries, obtained his office by corruption, and was deposed by the like means: fortunate indeed he was if no revolt among a people for whom he was deemed responsible hurried him without trial to the block or the gallows. And just as in lay matters, so in ecclesiastical, the subtle Greek, once subdued to Ottoman designs, was converted into a means for pressing the yoke on other subject races. The complete humiliation of Servia in the last century was marked by the abolition of its national church; the Porte united the Servian patriarchate with that of Constantinople, and commenced the practice of placing Greek ecclesiastics in all the high places of the Servian Church.

One of the most calamitous features of the Turkish conquest was that the Turks, unlike the old Persians, were led to so great an extent to occupy the towns. The result was of course to convert what should have been the centres of civilisation into centres of barbarism. If Larissa, Thessalonica, Constantinople itself, had remained as Greek republics paying tribute to the Sultan, just as the Italian republic of Ragusa, they might have kept up the old Hellenic life in its civilised form. But generally each great town became an Ottoman garrison; the rayahs either dwelt in the towns as a subject caste, or were left in occupation of the rural districts. The result was that the subject races became nearly as barbarous as their masters. Still they were allowed to retain rude forms of municipality and self-government*, which ought to have been taken as the groundwork of the future constitution of liberated Greece. The rayahs might indeed, in quarrels among themselves, seek for justice at the hands of the Moslem Cadi according to the law of the Prophet; but they might also seek it from judges of their own race according to the ordinances of Justinian and Basil. Nothing could exempt them from tribute

to their foreign master, but its immediate assessment was in the hands of the elders of their own people. But here again, the chiefs or proestotes of these little republics were exposed to the same temptation as the Patriarchs and Princes of the Phanar. They had at once to satisfy the Turks and to enrich themselves; so that often the poor rayah was no less oppressed by his own brethren than by his foreign invader.

In the *Ægean Islands*, above all in Hydra, Spetza, and Psara, local independence was carried still further. They annually contributed their contingent of money to the coffers, and of men to the fleets, of the Grand Signor; but they were unconscious of his existence during the remainder of the year. No Turk dwelt among them; they formed perfect republics, aristocratic or democratic at pleasure, precisely like the old islanders 2000 years before.

Other classes of rayahs indeed, even on land, were enabled to preserve a wilder and more precarious independence. When a land is occupied by strangers, — when their rule is one merely of terror or of sordid interest, — when what calls itself law and government is looked upon as an enemy and not a friend, — the distinction between the patriot and the robber becomes very feeble indeed. Robbers of this class, the ‘Klephts’ of Pindus and Olympus, the ‘Heyducs’ of Servia, did but carry on, in a less regular shape, the work of Scanderbeg and Constantine. They were the defenders of liberty, who would not submit to the stranger, but lived at his cost, at least not more robbers than he. If their exactions sometimes extended to Christians as well as infidels, their general position condoned for occasional outrages; popular feeling was always on their side, and the successful Klepht figured as the hero of the national poetry. The Turkish power, unable to tame them, sometimes endeavoured to win them to its own ends. Bodies of Christians were, in these districts, allowed to bear arms, and were regarded as a sort of armed police. But if the Klepht sometimes turned *Armatole*, the *Armatole* also turned Klepht pretty much at discretion. In either case he was an armed Christian, an armed Greek, and a standing testimony that Greek nationality was not utterly extinct.

All these various influences tended to keep up the spirit of the nation. One class of men showed that Greeks could resist the dominion of the Sultan; another class showed that the Sultan could not dispense with the services of the Greeks; both showed that the Greeks could very well dispense with the Sultan altogether, whenever the sword of the Klepht and the wiles of the Phanariot should be united against him. They still

spoke the tongue which had lived on through republican freedom and imperial slavery; the rude papas still in his humble chapel celebrated the rites in which Emperors had joined in St. Sophia; Greek warriors still fought in the cause of freedom; Greek republics still exhibited freedom in a more settled form; nay, Greek princes ruled over subject nations, and Greek diplomatists took their place among the representatives of European powers. The nation was not dead; a long train of circumstances combined to strengthen its feeble life, and to prepare it for the struggle when the day of its full awakening drew nigh.

‘It is easy to see,’ said Lord Broughton, in his *Diary* of 1810, ‘that the Greeks consider their country to belong to them as much as it ever did, and look upon their right to the soil as not at all affected by an ejection of three centuries and a half. Their patriotism is a flame that has never been utterly smothered, although it has so long glimmered in obscurity, and has narrowly escaped from being, like the lamp of Rosicrucius, for ever extinguished by a heedless discovery.’ (*Travels in Albania, &c.*, vol. ii. p. 10.)

During the latter part of the last century and the early years of the present, a long train of events prepared the way for the final and glorious outbreak of 1821. Circumstances of various kinds threw nearly the whole commerce of the Levant into Greek hands; wealthy Greek merchants settled all over Europe, and both they and the Phanariot nobles of the capital contributed most liberally towards spreading literature and enlightenment among their countrymen. Hellenic schools arose in various places; Joannina in Epirus, and the unfortunate Kydonia on the coast of Æolia, were among the most celebrated; the ancient Greek authors were again studied, and the series of modern Greek authors commenced. The intellectual movement strengthened the yearnings of the national spirit for emancipation from the yoke, and showed that the day was coming when those yearnings should no longer be in vain.

Every example of the foreign or domestic weakness of the Ottoman Porte,—above all, every triumph of Christians against her,—was of course felt as an additional call to liberty. Not less effective in the same direction was every renewed instance of the cruelty and perfidy of the Mussulmans. While the mountaineers of Maina maintained their practical independence; while those of Czernagora laughed to scorn even the nominal supremacy of the infidel, there was hope for redress from their own good swords. While the Turk, once the terror of Europe, was surrendering province after province to a Power which at least professed to be their friend; while sympathy for their Eastern brethren was at last beginning to touch the hearts of Western

Christians, there was hope that the civilised world might yet arm to aid the cause of justice and liberty. During the great European war, bands of Greeks served under the banners both of France and England, and the settlement which followed its conclusion contained one stipulation which seemed to show the possibility of their race being once more counted among the nations. Close to their own shores, a portion of their own people received at least a nominal enfranchisement, and were placed under British protection. It may not be easy to reconcile the existence of an independent republic with the presence of a foreign executive ruler; yet the United States of the Ionian Islands did at least exhibit before their eyes a Greek national flag respected by foreign Powers; their strange constitution did at least invest a portion of the Greek race with the rights of men and with some imperfect instalments of the rights of citizens. Heavy as might be the hand of Sultan Thomas * (as Sir Thomas Maitland was called), it was at least lighter than that of Sultan Mahmoud. In a more distant corner of the empire they saw another race assert its rights and again assume a position among free States. Czerny George and his Servians could resist the whole weight of the Ottoman power; was the Greek of Peloponnesus or of Thessaly less worthy of freedom than his Ionian brother, less capable of winning it than a half-barbarous Slavonic tribe? Then the strange career of Ali Pasha, while inflicting additional miseries on their race, yet on the whole tended to raise their hopes; as an enemy of the Porte, his last days were spent in alliance with its enemies. The devastator of Chinara, of Souli, and of Parga became the accomplice of the Heteria, the confederate of insurgent Greece. In some of his wars Greeks had shared his triumphs; in others they won a purer fame in resisting his attacks. In either case he taught them their own strength. A hundred victories under his banner hardly gave them so true a lesson as the long resistance of Souli, the new Messenia — as the heroism and the end of its Aristomenes and its Theoclus, of Photos Tzavellas and Samuel ‘the Last Judgment.’ †

The growth again of the Russian power,—a power sharing

* Δεν ἴσχυσαν δὲ νὰ σθέσωσι τὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἐθνικισμὸν τῶν οὔτε ἡ σιδηρᾷ χεὶρ τοῦ τότε μεγάλου ἀρμοστοῦ Ὠμαῖ Ματτλάνδου, ἀξίου ἀνδρός, ἀλλὰ τόσον δεσποτικῶς, ὥστε οἱ ἴδιοι συμπατριῶταί του θέλοντες νὰ τὸν χαρακτηρίσωσι τὸν ὀνόμαζαν Σουλτάν-Ὠμαῖν (King Tom), Ἐς μάτην ὁ ἀρμοστής οὗτος κ. τ. λ. (*Trikoupi*, vol. ii. p. 87.)

† Ἠτελευταία κρίσις. The history of the monk who gave himself this extraordinary title may be found in Sir J. E. Tennent, vol. i. p. 464.

their faith, waging warfare against their enemies, professing to be their protector;—was another strong incentive to shake off the yoke. Catharine bestowed on her second grandson the imperial name of Constantine, as one who was destined to raise again the throne of the Flavii and the Palæologi. A large portion of the Greek nation were willing to accept him as their Emperor. The only Greeks, however, who prospered from her policy were those who individually obtained Russian protection, and those who, under her auspices, recolonised the old Milesian sites on the Euxine. The Russians, when they landed in Peloponnesus, expected a more general and numerous rising; the Greeks expected more extensive support from their imperial ally. The result was that the unlucky Peloponnesians were deserted, and given over for years to the merciless Albanians, till their very Ottoman masters interfered, and the savages were quelled by the combined operations of Greeks and Turks. Little indeed did the Greeks directly owe to Muscovy; but the course of the war accustomed them to measure their strength with the infidels; its closing scene added to the score of vengeance; even the tardy redress they obtained from the central power could only make them feel more strongly the weakness of a government which others could so long defy, and which required their aid to execute its decrees.

All these events, spread over a space of sixty years, prepared the way for the great War of Independence. Its outbreak was no sudden burst under some maddening temporary oppression, such as occasioned the kindred movement in Servia. When the decisive moment came, the Greeks were, owing to accidental causes, hardly better prepared than their Slavonic brethren; but the storm, which the infatuated Turks could not perceive, had been gathering for years. The vengeance of five centuries was slowly accumulated by the mysterious agency of a secret society, the famous Hetreria, whether the original scheme of Rhegas or of some later patriot. On the one hand, some of the proceedings of the Hetæria were extremely unscrupulous; countless persons were induced to join in its designs by the hope of foreign aid which had never been promised. On the other hand, it is highly creditable to a people certainly volatile, and whom some represent as the scum of humanity, to have preserved their secret so faithfully. The Society numbered members of every class and calling in every part of Europe; yet no fraudulent merchant, no venal Phanariot, was found to betray its mysteries to a Government too blind to discover them for itself. Some one in the lower degrees of the brotherhood did reveal what little he knew to Ali Pasha, but

Ali Pasha, the proscribed of the Sultan, could not be esteemed an enemy, and might almost have been enrolled in the *ὑπερτίτη Ἀρχή*.

The first scenes of the revolution deserve but little sympathy. We allude to the campaign of Alexander Ypselanti in the Danubian provinces, those unhappy lands which seem destined to be the first victims of every contending race, Russian, Turkish, Greek, or Austrian. A Hellenic revolt had no right to commence in a country where the Hellenic race certainly did not appear in its fairest light. Moldavia and Wallachia had more to complain of at the hands of Greeks than of Turks; excepting some recent restrictions on their commerce, their chief complaint against the Porte was that it had handed them over to Greek Princes. If they were, as was said, 'another Greece,' they were only Greece in the sense that Greece itself was Turkey. The expedition too was badly planned, and stained by greater crimes than any other portion of the revolution. Any amount of barbarity may be excused in half-savage peasants, when the reckoning of ages is paid off amid the excitement of a storm, but the massacre in cold blood of peaceful Mahometan traders by officers who knew something of the habits of civilised nations, reduced the Christian Greek below the level of the infidel barbarian. Yet even there some gleams of true nobility shone forth. The Sacred Band at Drageshan rivalled the fame of the Sacred Band at Chæronea, and no hero of ancient or modern Greece could surpass the unsullied patriotism and heroic end of George the Olympian.

It may be said that scenes of equal horror disgraced the cause of liberty in Greece itself; that acts of cruelty and of perfidy were committed by the insurgents which at once put them out of the pale of civilised sympathies; that their internal disputes, their furious party spirit, their selfish schemes of personal aggrandisement, showed them to be utterly unworthy of the freedom for which they were contending. In the latter these accusations may be admitted: the Greeks on many occasions disgraced their cause by acts of savage cruelty, too frequently in direct violation of their engagements. Their internal history is too often a record of bickerings between the primates and the captains, of personal rivalry between Alexander Mavrokordato and Demetrius Ypselanti. But the real wonder is, not that there was so much crime and dissension, but that there was so little. Considering the position of the Greeks it is much to their honour that they had any virtues left; that they had sufficient valour, sufficient unity and constancy, to carry on the struggle at all. The Greeks rose against a tyranny of

400 years' standing, the greatest evil of which was that it made its victims well-nigh as debased and barbarous as its ministers. By throwing off the Ottoman yoke, they threw off their only political centre; society was reduced to its first principles. Those who took part in the revolution consisted of persons of the most incongruous classes. What sort of unity could be expected from peasants with injuries to revenge upon oppressive landlords, Klephts from the mountains, with whom plunder and patriotism were identical, mingled with enthusiastic youths from European colleges and counting-houses, with civil and military officers whose ideas were all borrowed from those of Western Europe? One class of men were drawing up constitutions for united Hellas; another class had never before looked beyond their own valley or peninsula. In actual warfare the Greek saw in his enemy, not the mere machine of a power politically hostile, but the personal foe of his race and his religion; he had to revenge his enslaved country, his desecrated altars, his plundered home, perhaps his murdered kinsman, his sister or daughter carried off to the harem of a Pasha. Was it to be expected that a warfare such as this could be carried on quite like one between the armies of two civilised governments which unhappily entertain different views about a disputed frontier or about the general balance of power? It is one thing to fight in an orderly, respectable way, as a matter of professional duty; it is another when the smothered revenge of ages bursts forth upon the oppressor. In actual cruelty, in actual breach of capitulations, the Greeks rivalled the Turks. But what Greeks and what Turks? The Capitan Pasha and His Highness Mahmoud himself are to be set against Peloponnesian peasants and Ætolian brigands. Whenever capitulations were broken on the Greek side, it was by undisciplined multitudes whom no earthly power could control. Kolokotrones, old Klepht as he was, in the storm of Tripolitza, preserved the Albanians who had capitulated; so did Niketas still more effectually at the second capture of Acrocorinthus; but Kara Ali himself daily massacred unresisting Chians, and his master revelled in a perfect blood-bath in the imperial city. Add to this, that every act of cruelty on the part of the Turk was the insolence of wanton barbarity; in the Greek it was the terrible call of vengeance for the greatest wrongs that man can suffer,

Παίδων, παρθενών, γυναικῶν ἀνήκουστον φθορεῖαν.

And against these we have to set deeds which might have done honour to the heroes of Thermopylæ or of Morgarten. Think of Miaoulis and his patriot seamen; think of Kanaris in his

fireship; of the deaths of Diakos and of Botzares; think of Mavrokordato, the civilian of the Phanar, rivalling the deeds of Armatoles and Hydriotes, standing alone and unshaken till he saw the whole power of the barbarian broken beneath the mud walls of Mesolongi.

To turn our eyes for a moment to the other side, the greatest horrors are chargeable either on the Sultan personally, or on the fanatical Turkish populace. The Turkish muftis and cadis often opposed themselves to the popular frenzy; the head of the law at Constantinople was deposed by the Sultan, the head of the law at Smyrna was murdered by the populace, because they would not give their sacred sanction to massacres of Christians wholly guiltless of the revolution. Even the pashas and beys often seem just and merciful compared with their imperial master. It was by Sultan Mahmoud's own act that the Patriarch of the Eastern Church, who at the Sultan's order had anathematised the insurgents, without crime, without trial, without indictment, was seized on the holiest day of the year, immediately after the celebration of the holiest rite of his creed, was hanged before his own palace, a lying accusation affixed to his body, and his corpse at last given up to the worst of indignities, to the mockery of the Jewish rabble. It was by Sultan Mahmoud's own act, that the streets of Constantinople were deluged with the blood of victims slaughtered daily without offence or trial; that the law of nations was violated, and the crew of a friendly ship murdered for attempting merely to shelter men striving to escape from a land where their race and creed seemed doomed to extermination. That vessel bore the flag of Sardinia, to be displayed in the next generation in another cause.

The history of the war of independence naturally divides itself into four periods. The first embraces the year 1821, in the course of which the Turks were expelled from the whole of Peloponnesus and the adjoining provinces, and a national government was established. In the second, 1822-4, we find the vain attempts of the Porte single-handed to recover the revolted provinces, and the unhappy dissensions among the Greeks themselves. The third, commencing in 1825, gives a new character to the war by the appearance of Ibrahim Pasha in Peloponnesus. In the fourth, the great European Powers step in, and take the settlement of the affairs of Greece into their own hands.

The first year and a half of the war showed what each party could do without the intervention of foreign Powers

on either side. The insurrection, commencing in Peloponnesus on the famous March 25th, spread itself in a few months far beyond the narrow limits of the present Greek kingdom. The whole of the Greek race in European Turkey and the Islands, except where they were overawed by the immediate neighbourhood of the capital, took arms against their barbarian masters. The Greeks of Asia, unwarlike themselves and hemmed in by a Mahometan majority, took little or no part in the war, but were thereby only the more exposed to Turkish brutality. But Souli, Olympus, Magnesia, Greek Macedonia, Crete, Samos, had as great a hand in the early stages of the war as Maina or Mesolongi. But in Macedonia and Thessaly the Greeks could only maintain themselves in the mountains; the plains were not suited to the irregular warfare of *armatoles* and *pallekars*; and the forcing of the lines of Cassandra crushed the revolt in those regions. But from Ceta to Tænarus the Greeks themselves maintained their own ground for four years against their gigantic antagonist. At first, indeed, it seemed as if the peasant of Peloponnesus only saw a Turk in order to fly from him; but soon they gathered courage; the name of Ottoman was no longer a name of fear, and the turban and scimitar were seen without alarm. The field of Valtetsi broke the charm of Turkish just as Marathon did that of Persian invincibility. That fight and the storm of Tripolitza confined the infidels in Peloponnesus to four fortresses, and, except the momentary invasion of Dramales, the peninsula remained free from serious attack till the expedition of Ibrahim. The provinces north of the Isthmus had, during 1822, 1823, and 1824, to endure several Turkish invasions; but the Ottoman armies were either successfully repulsed or fell to pieces of themselves. The Greeks always remained in possession of the country. By sea too, the navies of Hydra, Spetza, and Psara maintained the superiority of the independent flag. Chios was devastated, Psara was lost, but her sons remained afloat, and helped to frustrate the naval expeditions even of Ibrahim himself. Crete too held out till Sphakiote turbulence and Egyptian invasion ruined the Greek cause in that island. At the close of 1824, Greece, in its narrower sense, was *de facto* an independent State; but it was less successful in maintaining internal tranquillity than in defending its territory against the enemy.

We have already said that the Greeks in general are not to be too harshly blamed for the internal dissensions of this period. They were no more than was to be expected. To devise a government suited to the circumstances was indeed a hard task, as it involved the reconciliation of two discordant

conditions. The geographical aspect of the country, the immemorial instincts of the people, pleaded for the retention of as much local independence as possible, and pointed to a federal republic as the natural mode of union. But for a people just set free from a barbarian master, many of them half-barbarians, utterly unused to political self-government, and engaged in a struggle for life and death, the strong hand of a single ruler seemed absolutely necessary. The course actually chosen was one which united the evils of either scheme, — that of an indivisible Republic with an executive council. Centralisation, combined with weakness, was the most dangerous condition of all. But Greece had supplied no man exactly qualified to play the part of Aratus, of Washington, or even of Czerny George; possibly the fact of the revolt originating in such a body as the Heteria precluded the possibility of any one man gathering his countrymen around him like the Servian hero. The men of the sword and the men of the pen could not agree, and no man sufficiently united both characters. Demetrius Ypselanti was a brave and honourable patriot, but he came into Hellas too full of notions of his own prescriptive right to be her sole master. Mavrokordato, again, heroically as he behaved at Mesolongi, was too little of the soldier, and not without a strong element of intrigue. Odysseus and Kolokotrones were useful on the field of battle, but positive evils everywhere else. The most perfect characters of all, men like Miaoulis, Kanaris, and Mark Botzaris, did their own duty in their own stations, without joining in the general struggle for power. But weighing one thing with another, one cannot doubt but that the policy of Mavrokordato was, on the whole, the right course. Too fond of western ideas for the people among whom he found himself, too much addicted, it may be, to inapplicable theories, and too anxious for personal power, his career was, through these eventful years, honourable to himself and useful to his country. He was the representative of order and civil government against military anarchy. The constitution of Epidaurus, with all its faults, was worth defending against the personal despotism and ruthless exactions of a swarm of kleptical captains. Mavrokordato too was one of the first to propose, what, undesirable in itself, was desirable under the circumstances, — the election of a foreign king, and that king, Prince Leopold.

During these years no foreign power openly interfered. The Greeks looked from the beginning for the support of Russia, but no Russian support came. Alexander, busy with his brother despots at Laybach, refused all aid to revolutionists,

even though support of this particular revolution would so well have fallen in with the traditional policy of Russia. Certainly no material aid was given; for the Greeks could gain nothing by a diplomatic dispute with the Porte about the martyrdom of the Patriarch; and the asylum given to fugitive Greeks in the Muscovite dominions was not a little tarnished by the subsequent expulsion of those who refused to become Muscovite subjects. Yet, if not Alexander, certainly Capodistrias, was diligently watching Greek affairs from the Russian point of view. There can be no doubt that Kolokotrones and others of the military party were, though most likely in ignorance, Russian instruments. The aims of Russia would of course be thwarted by the establishment of an independent and powerful Greek State, which it was at least the desire of the constitutional party to establish. The cloven foot was more distinctly shown in the Russian scheme to divide Greece into four principalities, standing in the same relation to the Porte as those of Moldavia and Wallachia. That such a scheme met with little approval in Greece needs hardly be added. But it was not till after the accession of Nicholas that Russia stepped forward prominently on the scene.

England was at first deeply and deservedly unpopular among the Greeks. The spectacle of brother Greeks fighting in good earnest for Greek independence, naturally made them feel still more strongly the anomaly of their Septinsular Republic. Volunteers from Cephallonia and Zante swelled the insurgent army in defiance of proclamations to the contrary. The fate of Parga, too, rankled in men's minds; perhaps no direct breach of faith, but certainly an 'untoward event,' calculated to bring England into odium with all oriental Christians. But the reign of King Tom did not last for ever, and the Greeks gradually found that all Englishmen were not of his mould. Philhellenism gradually spread, and became one of the badges of liberal principles at home. English men and English money were contributed to the good cause. Byron and Hastings and Church and Cochrane took their place among the native defenders of Hellas; and Greece began to transfer to England the affection which she had been so long wasting upon Muscovy. Even the powers that be began to relent: Greek blockades were recognised, and the infidels no longer openly abetted; till at last the general voice of humanity throughout Europe compelled the Western Governments seriously to entertain the question of the affairs of Greece.

From the Congress of Verona the Greeks had been dismissed with contumely. The representatives of legitimate monarchy could have no dealings with rebels; let them return to dutiful submission to their own sovereign. But in the beginning of

1825 it was difficult to avoid recognising the Greeks as an independent nation. For three years they had successfully resisted every attack upon their territory. They had a regular government, which just then was universally obeyed, and which had just discharged the favourite function of legitimacy; it had put down a rebellion. Even on diplomatic principles, it was hard to see on what ground the republic of Hellas was to be refused admittance into the circle of nations, unless those of Switzerland and North America were to be proclaimed as nests of rebels and brigands. In 1825 the scene began to change. The task of conquering independent Greece, which the Grand Turk and all his host had found themselves incapable of effecting, was transferred to a Power which was, to all practical purposes, a foreign ally. Mahomet Ali might owe a nominal allegiance to the Porte, but in truth he was as much the independent sovereign of Egypt as any of the old Pharaohs or Ptolemies. In the course of the two following years the disciplined bands of Ibrahim accomplished what the Ottomans alone had failed to do. He conquered nearly all Greece, both within and without the Isthmus, and the terrible war of extermination which he waged plainly showed that his intention was no other than the entire destruction of the Greek nation.

Never was Greece, throughout her struggle, either nobler or baser than in this its most fearful period. Never were her internal dissensions more violent; never were her deeds of heroism more glorious. Her navies still rode triumphant; as in the days of Xerxes, the barbarian might ravage her shores, but she still retained the empire of the waves. Hellenes and Philhellenes shone side by side; the glory of Frank Abney Hastings is intermixed with that of Constantine Kanaris; Kolokotrones and Odysseus might show selfishness by land; but old Miaoulis, the valiant, the disinterested, could cheerfully yield to a stranger the obedience which was refused to rulers of their own race. And on land too Greece in these years could exhibit one spectacle whose glory surpasses that of every event of modern times. What heart capable of any generous emotion does not kindle at the name of Mesolongi? That men can be found * to whom that name can afford a subject for mockery puts human nature in no very favourable light. Such at least were not the feelings of our fathers. Thirty years ago that glorious defence was classed among those events in the world's history which make us proud of being men. Month after month the little band of heroes beheld land and sea covered with the camp and fleets of

* *Thirty Years' Foreign Policy*, p. 203.

the barbarians ; as far as the eye could reach, the abomination of desolation rose on every mast and every standard. Yet not a man dreamed of surrender; what men, with arms in their hands, could dream of it, while they saw priests and women and children writhing on the stake beneath their walls? At last came that terrible night, that fearful sally, which surpasses the fame of Plataea and of Eira. Not the savage hordes of Reshid, not the disciplined battalions of Ibrahim, could endure that desperate charge. Mesolongi fell, but she fell as Saguntum, as Numantia, and as Zaragoza; and a cry went up from her ruins which brought down the vengeance of God and man upon the destroyer.

The patience of Christendom was at last exhausted. Nations, and even governments, could no longer sit by and look unconcerned upon such a scene. The political problem to be worked out by the Western Powers was to emancipate Greece without giving an advantage to Russia. Western interference was necessary. Common humanity demanded it; policy demanded it also, lest Russia should get the start and interfere alone, which, after the accession of Nicholas, Russia was certain to do. In any interference from the West, in order to establish an Hellenic State, two grand principles should have been acted upon, — to interfere no more than was absolutely necessary; to constitute the State in such a way as would make it least open to Russian influence. The more powerful the new State was, the less likely it was to become a Russian instrument. And power added to Greece was not necessarily power abstracted from Turkey. Epirus, Thessaly, Chalcis, Crete and Chios, add very little to the Sultan's power of resisting the Czar; they would have added infinitely to the respectability and independence of the Hellenic kingdom.

Now in 1824 and 1825 England was at the height of her popularity in Greece. A national vote was passed in August, 1825, formally putting Greece under British protection, and requesting the appointment of Prince Leopold as king. The vote was rather late, as Mesolongi was already besieged, and Ibrahim had commenced the devastation of Peloponnesus. Still England might have stepped in in 1825 as well as in 1827, and she would have done so in the glorious character of the defender of the oppressed, the protector voluntarily chosen by their own will. As it was, England held back, and instead of English Leopold for a king, the Greeks got Russian Capodistrias for a dictator. And, when we did interfere, we performed nothing till we had two other great Powers to back us. By fighting the battle of Navarino and then drawing back, we secured the odium of attacking Turkey

without the glory of liberating Greece. We left it to France to deliver Peloponnesus from her Egyptian bondage; we left it to Muscovy to put the finishing stroke to the definite independence of Hellas. That independence was not formally recognised by the Sultan till the treaty of Adrianople. That is to say, it was extorted by the presence of Muscovite troops south of Hæmus. Never was Russian diplomacy more successful. Yet the most enterprising of her campaigns was followed by the least extension of her territorial acquisitions. The treaty of Adrianople made no perceptible difference in the map of Europe; it made but a very trifling difference even in the map of Turkey. But Russia gained something much better than another slice of Moldavia. She vastly increased her influence among the Eastern Christians; she took one great step towards securing Greece as a practical dependency. The boon which ought to have come from England in 1825, did come from Muscovy in 1829. Even then the national party in Greece still pressed the crown in vain on one of the younger princes of the House of Bourbon. Yet now we turn round and abuse the Greeks for preferring Muscovy to England and France, for transferring to others the affection which they offered us and which we declined.

In establishing a Greek State, three main questions arose. What should be its extent? What should be its political constitution? What should be its external relations? Should it be an absolutely independent State, or one like Servia, in any way tributary to the Porte? All these questions were intimately connected with one another. In 1826 Mavrokordato and the present Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, in their conference at Metæchi, agreed upon the latter principle, and a vote to the same purpose was passed in the National Congress of the same year. Northern Greece, Peloponnesus, and Crete were to have an independent administration, the Sultan was to withdraw his troops from the Greek fortresses, but he was to be recognised as suzerain and to receive a tribute. The suzerainty was again admitted in the first draught of the final settlement in 1829, and was finally withdrawn in exchange for a diminution of the proposed Hellenic territory.

The absurdly contracted dimensions of the present kingdom at once fail to satisfy the national instincts of the Greek race, and to answer the political objects of its western protectors. A Greek kingdom ought, in all reason, to have included at least Crete at one extremity, and Chalcidice at the other. Such a Greek State need neither have been a tool of Russia nor an enemy of Turkey. Such a Greek State as now exists can hardly fail to be both.

The enemies of Greece always sneer at her as a 'petty State.' If Greece is a petty State, it is not by her own fault, but by the intrigues of Russia, by the blindness of England and France. Such an enlarged Greek State would, with any tolerable government, have been an independent and respectable State of the second order, the compeer of Sweden and Sardinia. Greece is 'petty,' Greece is ill-governed; one main reason that Greece is ill-governed is because Western diplomatists decreed that Greece should be petty.

Another has been the kind of Government established. Greece has suffered much from two evils: indiscriminate reference to its old days of glory; indiscriminate introduction of western ideas and imitation of western institutions. A monarchy was necessary, but the monarchy need not have been either bureaucratic or Bavarian. A native king was ideally the best; but no such king appeared, nor would the princely houses of Europe have approved of a *parvenu* Klephtic or Phanariot dynasty sitting among Bourbons and Hapsburgs. Of princely foreigners no one can doubt that King Leopold* was the best choice. Greece wanted a king who would govern as well as reign, but not govern after the manner of Otho. Again: the geographical aspect of the country, the instincts of the people, their history for three thousand years, all taught the lesson that, if actual federalism were excluded, still the institutions of the country ought to have been grounded on as broad a basis of local and municipal independence as was consistent with the existence of a strong central power. The municipalities of Greece had lived through ages of Roman despotism, of Frankish and Ottoman bondage. Next to her national church, they contributed, more than anything else, to preserve her national existence. They bore her safe through the revolutionary war, only to be extinguished by Capodistrias and the Bavarian regency. What did unlucky Hellas at last receive from her protectors? Neither a territory sufficient to make her respectable and independent, nor a form of government in any way suited to her wants. No federal republic, no municipal liberties, no native king, no foreign king chosen for merit. What she did get instead is best told in the pithy words of Colonel Leake.

* The causes which led that sagacious Prince to decline the proffered crown, are even now not all entirely known, but one of them undoubtedly was the circumscribed limits of the proposed kingdom, and the refusal of the protecting Powers to include Crete in the dominions of the monarchy. Had Prince Leopold accepted the crown, the destinies of Eastern Europe might have been changed.

' Had this treaty resulted in a kingdom under Prince Leopold, with the addition of the Ionian Islands, to the liberated portion of Greece, there was yet a chance of prosperity and progress for the Greek nation. But when a frontier towards Turkey was assigned through an unknown country, of which no map existed or could exist, because it had never been visited by any geographer, but which, nevertheless, the Duke of Wellington pronounced to be a good frontier,—when the very excusable hesitation and inquiries of the prince were coldly responded to, while no attempt was made to counteract the interested misrepresentations of Capodistrias, made for the purpose of deterring the prince from accepting the crown, the last opportunity was lost for establishing a respectable government in Greece by the influence of England.

' Had it been the intention of the Powers to retard the advancement of the Greek nation, nothing could have been better designed than the plan which they adopted. To govern a country composed of islands and peninsulas, a young prince was selected from the centre of continental Europe, and a regency appointed during his minority : who, instead of founding its measures of government upon the municipal system derived from remote antiquity, which, with assistance of their Church, had preserved the Greeks as a nation during the long winter of Turkish servitude, indulged themselves in making experiments of German despotism and German pedantry ; and instead of promoting the commerce and agriculture of the Greeks, which had been totally ruined by the war, and were their only means of existence, built a palace for their sovereign of paupers, and formed military and naval establishments, for a people who were protected from war, and prevented from engaging in it, by the very act which founded their independence.'

Before the final establishment of the monarchy came the administration of Capodistrias. The Corfiote dictator was Russian in his external, centralising in his internal policy ; he ruled without a parliament, and, what was much worse, he swept away the ancient local institutions of the country. Yet he had his merits ; he knew how to govern, and he did not insult common sense by the forms and ceremonies of an alien court. At last the pistol and the dagger of the Mavromichales cut short his career, and the path was opened for the Bavarian monarchy.

For the kingdom of Greece the wisdom of collective Europe selected a foreign boy, his power to be exercised by foreign regents till he came of age. Under existing circumstances, a king was necessary, and a foreign king unavoidable. But the king that was wanted was a hearty, practical working king ; a king who did not want a grand palace, a ceremonious court, or a vast army of officials. But the Bavarian notion of civilisation was to thrust all these things ready made upon a semi-barbarous and impoverished country. Civilisation and liberty

took the form of debt, taxation, foreign government, foreign legislation, and foreign habits. A palace was built at a ridiculous expenditure, but roads were left unmade, and agriculture was neglected. Even commerce, the natural element of the Greek, was fettered by absurd restrictions; oppressive custom-house regulations forbade immigration from the Turkish provinces and Christian Albania; absurd internal laws actually compelled the emigration of many who had already settled in the kingdom. The municipalities were nominally restored, but in such a form as simply to make them Government tools. A local oligarchy nominates three persons, of whom the king chooses one. For eight years after Otho's majority the royal power was restricted only by a council of state of the king's own choice.

It is quite possible that, under the existing circumstances of Greece, no system could have been thoroughly successful. The country, neither rich nor populous before the war, was still more depopulated and impoverished by that tremendous struggle. Not a village was standing, not a town was uninjured, agriculture had ceased, commerce was annihilated. Everything had to be created anew. The mass of the people were ignorant, while the intellectual classes were apt to be led astray by vain yearnings after an irrevocable past, by no less vain imitations of an inappropriate present. The Greece of Miaoulis and Mavrokordato was not the Greece of Phormion and Pericles; neither was it the Bavaria of King Lewis, nor the France of M. Guizot. It is quite possible that, under such a complication of opposite difficulties, any scheme might have failed; but the wisdom of Western politicians selected a scheme which, of all others, was the most infallibly sure to fail.

Not that we at all exculpate the Greeks from one enormous error at a later period. The bloodless revolution of 1843, which gave Greece a constitution, looks very well at first sight; but some great evils lurk beneath it. Centralisation lost nothing; municipality gained nothing. A democratic political constitution is a mere mockery, where it is not based on democratic local institutions. It is a farce to institute universal suffrage for the great council of the nation, while there is not universal suffrage for the petty council of the village. The true education for the greater politics is to be found in the practice of the less. Consequently, with enslaved municipalities and a vast and needless crowd of officials of all kinds, King Otho contrives to manage his democratic parliament by influence and corruption. Then too, on the approved French model, there is a senate named by the king; consequently it has neither the stability and independence of our hereditary chamber, nor does it, like the American senate,

reflect the maturer sense of the people themselves. This parliament is moreover paid, and meets for an annual talk of ten months in a year. Yet it cannot find time to make roads, to suppress brigandage, or to encourage agriculture. We fear that the Greeks are too anxious to make a show with a court, a capital, a parliament, instead of attending to these essentials.

Yet, after all, they are very poor reasoners indeed who regard the Greeks as utterly debased, or venture to hint that Greece has gained nothing by her emancipation.

She has gained the greatest gift of all. Greece is again a nation. The Greek again takes his place among freemen. Is not this alone worth all the trials and sufferings of his awful struggle? may it not even counterbalance a certain amount of real misgovernment? Men often prefer a bad government of their own to a good one forced on them by strangers. Not all the manifest advantages of British connexion can reconcile the Ionian Greeks to dependence while independent Hellas is within sight. Nor can the present absence of any gross practical oppression hinder the Greeks of the still Turkish islands from loathing their subjection to the Moslem.

Again, the bitterest enemies of Greece seldom venture to deny that the kingdom of Greece is possessed of an admirable legal system.* In this respect she does owe something to her Bavarian friends. Maurer at least may be ranked among the benefactors of Greece; but it is her own energy which has kept up the system in good practical working. Was it not worth striking a blow or too, to get intelligent judges, able advocates, trial by jury, instead of the arbitrary edicts of a foreign pasha or the decisions of a foreign *cadi*? Surely, again, it is no light matter for a people, especially under such circumstances as the Greeks, to proclaim, for the first time in Europe, full and real religious equality. In the constitution of Epidaurus, Rayahs, just delivered from Moslem bondage, Greeks, whose nationality and religion were identical, decreed full civil equality for the Mahometan and the Jew. In the constitution of the kingdom political is added to civil liberty; all Hellenic subjects are equal; the Mahometan of Chalcis, the Latin of Syra, enjoys the same privileges as the most devout votary of the Orthodox Church.

After a desolating war which annihilated commerce, by converting a mercantile into a military marine, it would be something for Greece to have merely recovered the commercial po-

* M. About attempts to depreciate Greek jurisprudence. From him we appeal to the far higher authority of a writer in Blackwood's Magazine for Nov. 1854.

sition which she possessed before the war. But she has done far more, in spite of the fantastic regulations which impede her progress. Her commerce advances daily at home and abroad. When Lord Broughton left Greece in 1810, he remarked as an extraordinary fact that some of the traders of Hydra had one or two vessels engaged in commerce with America and England. In 1850 the Greeks of the kingdom owned 4046 merchant vessels amounting to 236,221 tons burden. Possibly the outcry against Greece may be owing in no small degree to the fact that her enterprising sons scattered throughout Europe are drawing into their hands the whole commerce of the Levant. Against the common accusations of swindling and fraudulent dealing brought in so vague and indiscriminate a way against the whole Greek mercantile profession, it is very easy to set the fact that the failure of a Greek house is a thing unheard of. This is at least a presumption that they are both above the ordinary acuteness, and not below the ordinary honesty, of their own calling. And no class of men have done more for the advancement of their country than these same Greek merchants who have risen to wealth in foreign lands.

In all intellectual and literary pursuits no one can deny the vast advances of the Hellenic kingdom. Her press is as free as our own; political discussion is carried on with perfect liberty and high ability; literary works multiply on every conceivable subject. Athens has a flourishing university, with distinguished professors. Greece got the start of Professor Maurice and Mr. Tennyson's Princess in establishing a public *Παρθενοναρχεον*. Nowhere is education of all kinds more earnestly sought after by all ranks: in schools too poor to provide paper for their scholars, they trace their alphas and omegas in the sand, and repeat and appreciate the rhapsodies of their earliest poet.

But whilst these signs of progress and civilisation may be traced in the port of Syra and the school of Athens, there is much to deplore in the condition of the provinces. The population of the kingdom of Greece does not augment; the cultivation of the soil is strangely and wilfully neglected; and instead of those habits of industry which ought to flourish among a free peasantry, the tendency to atrocious agrarian outrages, called by the Greeks 'brigandage,' has lamentably increased, and prevails to an extent which is deeply disgraceful to the government and to the community. The excesses committed within the last few months by these bands of robbers, murderers, and extortioners, are so abominable, that all personal security is at an end in many districts, and nothing but the presence of a certain number of foreign troops appears to save

the kingdom from the horrors of social dissolution. The weak and profligate government of King Otho is responsible not only for the impunity which attends these crimes, but for the cause which has mainly produced them. Hundreds of adventurers and ruffians, encouraged by the King and Queen, and stimulated by the hope of plunder and by Russian intrigues, flocked to the frontier at the outset of the war. They were soon driven back by the forces of the Porte, though not before they had inflicted atrocious wrongs on the Turkish subjects of Thessaly. Yet these marauders were immediately amnestied by the Greek government. At the same time, General Kalergis disbanded the irregular troops, and thus the most brutal and lawless part of the population was let loose upon the country. Such is the terror inspired by these banditti, that in some villages the peasantry have refused to sow corn for sale, and are falling into complete despair. This horrible state of things will work its own cure; but we do not conceal our expectation that the Court will one day expiate the evils it has brought upon the people. One element at least there is which ought in some degree to counteract this disorder. The Greeks settled abroad in great numbers, are an intelligent and wealthy class, who estimate as highly as any men the advantages of law and order. They are to the Klephts and brigands of Pindus and Parnassus, what the Scotch settlers in India and America were to their Highland countrymen, who, not two hundred years ago, made the north of this Island as wild and lawless a country as Greece is now. Scotland has been peopled, enriched, and civilised by the foreign enterprise of her children, and the Greeks have the same attachment to their native land. It rests with them to find means to improve the condition of their countrymen, and to put an end to a state of things which is a disgrace to their name.

In order to promote the permanent welfare of the Greek kingdom, and gradually to extend the blessings of toleration, of freedom, and of civil rights, to the Christian inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire, it is far more essential to raise the character of the Greek nation and to fit them for the duties of self-government, than suddenly to invest them with the arduous responsibility of conducting the affairs of an empire. We can entertain no doubt that the course of those extraordinary events which mark the revolutions of power in the East is tending, by slow, but certain, degrees to place that power in the hands of the race which shall show itself most capable of improvement, most eager for civilisation, most faithful to legality and order, most constant to the faith of Christ. At this very moment

this change is going on, and the last three years have done more to modify the constitution of the Ottoman Empire than the three centuries which preceded the last war. The Sultan has for the first time become a member of the great family of Christian nations as the sovereign of a numerous Christian people. The Padishah wears on his breast the *Cross* of the French Legion of Honour, and ere long a monumental Cross, raised by the care of the British Government, will mark the resting place of those gallant Englishmen who sleep upon the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus, in front of St. Sophia. To the eager eyes of the Christians of the East those symbols have a meaning which wipes out the remembrance of ages of oppression and opens an æra of toleration and justice. The Fourth Point of the preliminaries of peace, which is to secure the extension of equal rights to the Christian subjects of the Porte, is a result of the war of more lasting interest to mankind than the triumphs of the allied armies, for, if it be faithfully observed, it emancipates a people. It opens to the Christian population of the East justice in the courts of law, employment in the service of the State, distinction in the ranks of the army. The Christian is henceforward no slave or rayah, but a subject and a citizen. The effect of these measures has been very ably examined and discussed by Mr. George Mano, in a pamphlet on 'The Fourth Point'; and no one speaks on this subject with greater authority than this gentleman, who is himself a highly accomplished and learned representative of the nation whose cause he pleads. The measures recently promulgated by the supreme authority of the Sultan, at the very moment when the conferences for peace were about to open in Paris, have, as far as legal declarations can go, achieved these great objects; they have yet to triumph over the resistance opposed to such reforms by the ancient prejudices and antipathies of different races and different creeds. But the great principle of equality of rights is henceforth secured to the whole Christian population of the East; and the most glorious result of the war carried on by the Western Powers against Russia is the complete emancipation of the Greek nation, and of all the Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire.

- ART. IV.—1. *Chapters on Mental Physiology.* By Sir HENRY HOLLAND, Bart., M.D., F.R.S. 1852.
2. *Psychological Inquiries: in a Series of Essays, intended to Illustrate the Mutual Relations of the Physical Organization and the Mental Faculties.* By Sir B. C. BRODIE, Bart., D.C.L., F.R.S. Third Edition: 1856.
3. *On the Reflex Function of the Brain. An Essay.* By THOMAS LAYCOCK, M.D. (British and Foreign Medical Review. Jan. 1845.)
4. *Farther Researches into the Functions of the Brain.* By THOMAS LAYCOCK, M.D., &c. (British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review. July, 1855.)
5. *Medical Notes and Reflections.* By Sir HENRY HOLLAND, Bart., M.D., F.R.S., &c. Third Edition. 1855.

FEW men doubt that they use the brain as the organ of thought; fewer doubt that the mind which thinks influences the bodily organ, and that the organ influences the mind. The result of this continued conjoint action is life. Now, mental physiology, according to Sir Henry Holland's definition, marks 'that part of human physiology which comprises the 'reciprocal actions of mental and bodily phenomena as they make 'up the totality of life.' And since no physician can rightly fulfil his duties without an adequate knowledge of, and constant regard to, these important relations, it is not surprising that physicians and surgeons of the highest eminence have devoted a large share of thought and labour to the elucidation of mental physiology. Amongst the most recent results of these labours are the works before us.

It would be a great mistake, however, to look at the subject of mental physiology as nothing more than a branch of medical science and art; for if a knowledge of these reciprocal relations of body and mind be absolutely necessary for the right management of morbid and, therefore, occasional conditions only, how much more necessary must it be for the uses of daily life? If every intelligent man had some portion of that knowledge which the accomplished physician or surgeon requires for the right exercise of his art, and could apply it to regulate the ever-varying circumstances of his existence, how much suffering would he avoid, how much error would he escape, how much happiness would he secure!

Before a man can at all estimate the reciprocal influence of body and mind, he must, in some degree at least, have formed a

notion of what they are. It is in this knowledge that the unprofessional mind is deficient. There is no lack of *empirical* or popular knowledge,—that is, of what will affect the mind through the body, or the body through the mind. The savage brute who wishes to wreak his vengeance on his wife, or to commit some sin of malice against his neighbour, knows well that the gin-shop supplies the means whereby his cowardly nature may be rendered sufficiently bold for the meditated outrage. The cunning auctioneer will push the glass about to awaken the dormant passions of his auditors, hoping (like ‘honest Iago’) that the fate of some may be that of Cassio, who, when well plied with wine, solaced himself with the reflection that his state of consciousness was not altogether irregular. ‘Do not think, gentlemen, I am drunk; this is my ancient, this is my right hand, and this is my left hand.’ Yet Cassio did find that his mental condition was wofully changed by nothing less imponderable than a stoup of liquor, and philosophically traced out cause and effect wher he exclaimed, — ‘Oh, that men should put an enemy into their mouths to steal away their brains!’ — ‘To be now a sensible man, by and by a fool, and presently a beast!’

The influence of mere material agents on the mental powers is never shown more strikingly and conclusively than in the effects of certain drugs—as opium, Indian hemp, henbane, chloroform. The doses of the latter can be so exactly graduated as to induce every form of mental disorder from exalted delirium to that happy abolition of all consciousness which disarms the surgical knife of its greatest terrors, and renders it a welcome blessing. Who can have read the ‘Psychological Confessions of the English Opium-Eater,’ without a sort of fascination? marvelling much that a few grains of an inspissated vegetable juice should fill the mind with the most gorgeous images, — ‘building upon the bosom of darkness, out of the fantastic imagery of the brain, cities and temples, beyond the art of Phidias or Praxiteles — beyond the splendour of ‘Babylon and Hekatompylos.’ Hachisch (the extract of Indian hemp) is used as a substitute for opium by Orientals, and its first effect is usually an intense feeling of happiness. The hachisch-eater is happy, not like the sensualist, or the gluttonous voluptuary, but like him who hears glad tidings, or is intoxicated with success. He says, with Romeo, ‘My bosom’s lord sits lightly on his throne.’ It exalts and magnifies all other states of consciousness. Minutes seem hours,—hours years. Theodore Gautier, a French writer of some note, found, when under its influence, that the slightest deep sound produced the effect

of rolling thunder; his own voice appeared so tremendous to him, that he did not dare to speak out for fear of throwing down the walls, or of himself bursting like a bomb. Nothing is more common, in short, than this empirical knowledge of the action of material agents on the spiritual faculties, and yet the bulk of mankind know nothing of mental physiology. To attain to this knowledge, it is first and most emphatically necessary to know something of the natural history of the organ and of the agent.

What, then, is this consciousness? is the question of Sir Henry Holland:—

‘Scarcely,’ he replies, ‘can we render the conception of it clearer by definition, or describe what is inseparable from our existence and identity of being. Language here, as so often elsewhere, fails in meeting the emergency; and the very simplicity of the fact tends to make it less obvious to common comprehension. We have, in the instrument of examination, the actual thing to be examined; for we cannot better describe the mental life of man than as embodied in a succession of acts or states of consciousness so continuous as to give and maintain the sense of personal identity.’ (P. 47.)

There can be no question whatever, we think, that this is as near an exposition of mental life as general terms will permit. But the inquiry immediately arises, whether these successive states of consciousness are single at the same instant of time, or whether (to use Sir Henry’s own words) our mental existence is to be viewed as a wide and mixed current, in which various sensations, thoughts, emotions, and volitions do actually coalesce and coexist as to time, and are simultaneously conveyed to us by this common consciousness. Let an individual carefully examine his own perceptions in this respect, and he will arrive at some important knowledge. He will find how incessant, instantaneous, abrupt, is the change in the state of consciousness, — how continuous the stream, — how impotent his will to alter or modify the successive conditions. Yet at every moment there is unity of thought. The mind can only be in one state, or occupied with one notion or idea, at the same moment. This is the logical deduction from all we know of the phenomena of sensation, and its accuracy may be ascertained by observation.

‘Place yourself,’ Sir Henry Holland remarks, ‘in the crowded streets of a city, a thousand objects of vision before your eye—sounds hardly less various coming upon the ear—odours also constantly changing—contact or collision at every moment with some external object. Amidst this multitude of physical objects of sensation, and with all the organs of sense seemingly open, one alone (whether in itself simple or compound does not affect the question) will be found

at each moment distinctly present to the mind. It combines them only by giving close and rapid sequence to the acts of attention. Let the trial be made to attend at once to the figures of two persons within the same scope of vision; or to listen at the same moment to two distinct sounds; or to blend objects of sight with those of hearing in the same act of attention. The impossibility will instantly be felt, and the passage of the mind from one act to another very often recognised. Or, under the same circumstances, let the mind pass suddenly, by will or accident, into a train of inward thought, whatever the subject, and all the external objects thus crowded around you utterly disappear, though the physical agents producing, and the organs receiving sensations, remain precisely as before. Every sense sleeps while the mind is thus awake and active within itself. A man so occupied may be alone in a multitude.'

Thus in a few short sentences—nay, in a few short words—Sir Henry Holland gives the key to those phenomena of attention, which, under the term mesmeric, have excited the wonder, curiosity, and credulity of men. '*Every sense sleeps while the mind is thus awake and active within itself.*' Let the consciousness be occupied continuously with one idea or train of ideas, and nothing else *can* find a place: the external world and all its influences are shut out; there is neither pain nor pleasure from outer agencies, nor is there perception of any kind whatever. A full orchestra may be executing a chorus of Handel while the mind is wholly absent from any consciousness of it. The loudest roar of cannon may be annihilated, at moments, to the officer who is intently engaged in manœuvring his regiment or his ship in the hour of battle. The terms absence of mind, abstraction, and reverie indicate mental conditions of this kind. Illustrations are related which would appear to be incredible if not well authenticated, and wholly in accordance with these fundamental facts of consciousness.

Having clearly and once for all ascertained that there can be only one state of consciousness at one and the same moment, let the inquirer discard the converse proposition as utterly erroneous and as absolutely fatal to the right study of mind; for it is a fundamental error, and will vitiate all his inquiries and conclusions as to the true nature and relations of mental phenomena. This proposition being fully established, the inquiry arises, with what rapidity do these all-absorbing states of consciousness succeed each other? This question Sir Henry Holland discusses in his fourth chapter '*On Time, as an Element in Mental Functions,*'—a question which necessarily involves an inquiry into the relations which the *organ* of mind bears to its states of consciousness. It is obvious to all who

direct their attention to the mental condition of the paralytic, or of persons labouring under that morbid condition of the brain known as *softening*, that in them the states of consciousness succeed each other with a rapidity manifestly much less than in a healthy condition of the organ. It is also well known that when the brain is stimulated by alcohol, opium, or other *nervine* narcotics, the states of consciousness succeed each other at a greatly accelerated rate of progress. And so also in acute mania. Robert Hall when convalescent from mania remarked, 'You, with the rest of my friends, tell me that I was only seven weeks in confinement, and the date of the year corresponds, so that I am bound to believe you; but they have appeared to me like seven years. My mind was so excited, and my imagination so lively and acute, that more ideas passed through my mind during those seven weeks than in any seven years of my life.'

Some of the most singular illustrations of the rapidity with which states of consciousness succeed each other have been afforded by persons in whom there has been a sense of great personal danger, as during an accident, with, at the same time, a circulation of undecarbonised blood through the brain. The accidents of hanging and drowning are of this character. Binns relates the following:—

'We are acquainted with a gentleman, who, being able to swim but little, ventured too far out, and became exhausted. His alarm was great; and, after making strenuous, but ill-directed efforts to regain the shore, he shouted for assistance, and then sank, as he supposed, to rise no more. The noise of the water in his ears was at first horrible, and the idea of death—and such a death—terrific in the extreme. He felt himself sinking as if for an age; and descent, it seemed, would have no end. But this frightful state passed away. His senses became steeped in light. Innumerable and beautiful visions presented themselves to his imagination. Luminous ærial shapes accompanied him through embowering groves of graceful trees; while soft music, as if breathed from their leaves, moved his spirit to voluptuous repose. Marble colonnades, light-pierced vistas, soft grassy walks, picturesque groups of angelic beings, gorgeously plumaged birds, golden fish that swam in purple waters, and glistening fruit that hung from latticed arbours, were seen, admired, and passed. Then the vision changed; and he saw, as if in a wide field, the acts of his own being, from the first dawn of memory to the moment when he entered the water. They were all grouped and ranged in the order of succession of their happening, and he read the whole volume of existence at a glance. . . . From this condition of beatitude—at least, these were the last sensations he could remember,—he awoke to consciousness, and consequently to pain, agony, and disappointment.'

The confirmation of this wonderfully rapid succession of states under the circumstances given, is afforded by similar instances, not differing in any essential particular: yet the period between the cessation of respiration and loss of consciousness in drowning is exceedingly short, not occupying more than three minutes, and probably even a less time.

A similar rapidity of succession takes place probably in all morbidly excited affections of the cerebrum. The confessions of the English Opium-eater describe phenomena of the imagination under the influence of that drug not different from those just related. In dreams it is a matter of popular knowledge that there is an exceedingly rapid succession of these states:—

‘ Each faintest trace that memory holds
 So darkly of departed years,
 In one broad glance the soul beholds,
 And all that was — at once appears.’

We may admit, with Sir Henry Holland, that this notion is vague, as everything in the world of dreams must necessarily be, and incapable of anything like proof. Occasionally, however, something like definiteness is obtained under very special circumstances. Count Lavalette thus describes a dream, and the time it occupied:—

‘ One night, while I was asleep, the clock of the Palais de Justice struck twelve, and awoke me. I heard the gate open to relieve the sentry, but I fell asleep again immediately. In this sleep I dreamed that I was standing in the Rue St. Honoré, at the corner of the Rue de l’Echelle. A melancholy darkness spread around; all was still. Nevertheless, a low and uncertain sound soon arose. All of a sudden, I perceived, at the bottom of the street, and advancing towards me, a troop of cavalry; the men and horses, however, all flayed. The men held torches in their hands, the flames of which illuminated faces without skin, and with bloody muscles. Their hollow eyes rolled in their large sockets, their mouths opened from ear to ear, and helmets of hanging flesh covered their hideous heads. The horses dragged along their own skins in the kennels, which overflowed with blood on both sides. Pale and dishevelled women appeared and disappeared alternately at the windows in dismal silence; low inarticulate groans filled the air, and I remained in the street alone, petrified with horror, and deprived of strength sufficient to seek my safety by flight. This horrible troop continued passing in rapid gallop, and casting frightful looks on me. Their march, I thought, continued for five hours, and they were followed by an immense number of artillery waggons, full of bleeding corpses, whose limbs still quivered. A disgusting smell of blood and bitumen almost choked me. At length, the iron gate of the prison, shutting with great force, awoke me again. I made my repeater strike, it was no

more than midnight, so that the horrible phantasmagoria had lasted no more than *ten minutes*; that is to say, the time necessary for relieving the sentry and shutting the gate. The cold was severe, and the watchword short. The next day the turnkey confirmed my calculations. I nevertheless do not remember one single event in my life, the duration of which I have been able more exactly to calculate.*

Sir Benjamin Brodie supplies another instance: —

‘The late Lord Holland was accustomed to relate the following anecdote of what had happened to himself. On one occasion, when he was much fatigued, while listening to a friend who was reading aloud, he fell asleep and had a dream, the particulars of which it would have occupied him a quarter of an hour or longer to express in writing. After he awoke, he found that he remembered the beginning of one sentence, while he actually heard the latter part of the sentence immediately following it, so that probably the whole time during which he had slept did not occupy more than a few seconds.’

The time occupied by a volition, or act of will, gives in some degree a measure of the speed of mental action, and of the rapidity with which one state of consciousness gives place to another. The readiness of an ‘excitable’ person, and the slowness of a lymphatic one, is matter of popular observation. Sir H. Holland remarks, with great justice, that,—

‘In extreme old age, which variously expresses, through the effects of gradual change, the more sudden but transient anticipation of disease, there appears to exist not merely an impairment of the powers of perception and volition, but also of those actions, whatever their nature, upon which association and suggestion depend. The train of thought may be just in its order and conclusions, but it is more slowly pursued. A longer time, in the strict meaning of the phrase, is required for those connexions, and changes by succession, which occur in every such continuous action of mind. Here, too, as in disease, there is more of toil and difficulty in all intellectual operations—from the simple act of attention to the more complex ones of association and thought. The mind speedily becomes fatigued, the chain is broken, and confusion ensues. Observation shows these occurrences, in every shade and degree, in the medical cases which come before us, and they often afford the most curious and unexpected analysis of mental conditions, which in their more perfect and healthy state seem to be indissolubly united.’

This extract is a good illustration of the subtlety, and at the same time the practical value, of Sir Henry Holland’s views.

* Sleep Psychologically considered with reference to Sensation and Memory. By Blanchard Fossgate, M.D. New York: 1850.

Experiments are not wanting which would seem to supply the means of an approximative measurement of the rapidity of mental acts. A very large proportion of astronomical observations consist in noting the moment at which a star passes before the micrometer-threads of a telescope. The moment of this transit can be indicated, under the most favourable conditions, to a tenth of a second. Two senses are engaged in the operation, for while the observer watches the star, he listens to the strokes of the pendulum-clock, which stands near. When the star comes near the thread he notes its exact distance from it at a certain stroke of the pendulum, and then its exact distance past the thread at the next stroke. From a comparison of the distances on each side, the true moment of transit is estimated. Professor Bessel, of the Königsberg Observatory, remarked that he evidently did not note the moment at which the star impinged on the threads synchronously with the other observers. Experiments were made to elucidate this point; and it was found, practically, that they all differed more or less from each other. Nicolai, of the Mannheim Observatory, also made experiments with Knorre of the Observatory at Nicolaief, and Clausen of Denmark. Knorre noted the true moment half a second later, and Clausen one-third of a second, while Bessel noted his observation a second earlier than Knorre. It is not easy to say how much time should be allotted to perception, and how much to volition in cases of this kind. It is to be regretted that M. Nicolai stopped short in these experiments; for the habit of accuracy which a training in astronomical observation gives, is eminently useful in the observation of mental phenomena. One general fact is deducible from these remarks; namely, that there is a very considerable difference as to the rapidity with which mental states succeed each other.

Although the mind is a unity, certain morbid states of the consciousness occur, from which the conclusion has been most erroneously drawn that the mind is dual. These states are known as *double consciousness*. Insanity and somnambulism, and even ordinary dreaming, offer illustrations of this condition. Sometimes the individual has two separate currents of mental existence, running alternately, for a definite period of time, and wholly independently of each other. Thus, for a certain number of hours he will be in a given mental state, and be morose, joyous, clever; and then his whole state will change into the contrary, or what may be termed his natural condition. When he is in the one condition he has no recollection whatever of what occurred in the other, so that the one half of his existence is an entire blank to the other half. This is what occurs in certain

forms of somnambulism. In insanity the same peculiarity appears in another form. The subject of it holds imaginary conversation with himself as though he were a second person; overwhelms himself with wit, overcomes himself in argument, not knowing all the while that this strange conduct is produced by the alternate action of the two halves of his cerebrum. There can be no doubt, we think, that it is erroneous to term this state 'duality of mind;' it is, as Sir Henry Holland conclusively argues, duality of function. A very practical conclusion Sir Henry draws from this singularly interesting state is, that this duality of function may occasionally be the cause of insanity.

'The considerations already stated,' he remarks, 'bring us immediately to the question whether some of the aberrations of mind which come under the name of insanity, are not due to incongruous action of this double structure, to which perfect unity of action belongs in the healthy state. . . . It has been a familiar remark that in certain states of mental derangement, as well as in some cases of hysteria which border closely upon it, there appear, as it were, two minds; one tending to correct, by more just perceptions, feelings, and volitions, the aberrations of the other, and the relative power of these influences, varying at different times. Cases of this singular kind cannot fail to be in the recollection of every medical man. I have myself seen many such, in which there occurred great disorder of mind from this sort of double dealing with itself. In some cases there would seem to be a double series of sensations; the real and unreal objects of sense impressing the individual so far simultaneously that the judgment and acts of mind are disordered by their concurrence. In other instances, the incongruity is chiefly marked in the moral feelings, an opposition far more striking than that of the incongruous perceptions, and forming one of the most painful studies to the observer of mental disease.'

The last state of mind we have to notice is the most curious of all, viz., the unconscious state; or, in other words, the succession of mental states of which we are not cognisant at the time of transition, or of which we often become cognisant by the results only, as an act of memory, in dreams, delirium, and other morbid states. To speak of unconscious mental states, or of unconscious mind, is apparently paradoxical; but let the reader carefully examine the state of his own mind,—his volitions, perceptions, trains of thought,—and he will find multitudinous examples of mental states which never reach his consciousness, or, at least, *would* never have reached it, had he not sought for them, watched for them, and by a vigorous mental effort set them before his 'mind's eye.' This kind of state is not dissimilar from that of the unconsciousness

to external objects which we have already noted. It is, in fact, a state in which the mind is not conscious of internal mental operations, just as in the latter it is not conscious of external impressions. Thus a banker's clerk will run his eye over a column of figures and will name the total without any consciousness of the details of the process. So the reader of these pages has been reading sentence after sentence without any definite consciousness of the structure of each component phrase, or of their relation to each other as a whole. Dr. Carpenter, in his valuable chapter on the Functions of the Nervous System*, places in this category a much higher class of mental phenomena than even these.

'Most persons who attend to their own mental operations are aware that when they have been occupied for some time about a particular subject, and have then transferred their attention to some other, the first, when they return to the consideration of it, may be found to present an aspect very different from that which it possessed before it was put aside, notwithstanding that the mind has since been so completely engrossed with the second subject as not to have been consciously directed towards the first in the interval. Now a part of this change may depend upon the altered condition of the mind itself, such as we experience when we take up a subject in the morning with all the vigour which we derive from the refreshment of sleep, and find no difficulty in overcoming difficulties and in disentangling perplexities which checked our further progress the night before, when we were too weary to give more than a languid attention to the points to be made out, and could use no exertion in the search for their solutions. But this by no means accounts for the *entirely new development* which the subject is frequently found to have undergone when we return to it after a considerable interval; a development which cannot be reasonably explained in any other mode than by attributing it to the intermediate activity of the cerebrum, which has in this instance automatically evoked the result without our consciousness.'

Dr. Carpenter states that he submitted these views to Sir W. Hamilton and Mr. John Mill. Mr. Mill assured him that the fact of the unconscious development of a subject of thought was so familiar to him, that when he found it difficult to pursue an inquiry farther, not seeing his way clearly through its entanglements, he was accustomed to lay it aside for weeks or even months, and to devote himself to some other object, with the full expectation (derived from frequent experience) of being able to prosecute his first investigation with diminished difficulty, whenever he might feel disposed to resume it. Sir

B. Brodie makes an observation to the same effect in his 'Psychological Inquiries.' Referring the *development* of ideas to this principle, as in the case of poetic creations and scientific discoveries, he adds,—

'But it seems to me that on some occasions a still more remarkable process takes place in the mind, which is even more independent of volition than that of which we are speaking; as if there were in the mind a principle of order which operates without our being at the time conscious of it. It has often happened to me to have been occupied by a particular subject of inquiry; to have accumulated a store of facts connected with it; but to have been able to proceed no farther. Then, after an interval of time, without any addition to my stock of knowledge, I have found the obscurity and confusion, in which the subject was originally enveloped, to have cleared away; the facts have seemed all to have settled themselves in their right places, and their mutual relations to have become apparent, although I have not been sensible of having made any distinct effort for that purpose.'

These are singularly curious and interesting statements, and valuable contributions to mental physiology, although we are inclined to doubt whether the results of a repose from a subject for weeks or months can be placed in exactly the same category as those following from a much shorter period.

But, in fact, as has been pointed out by Sir William Hamilton, these observations and this doctrine had, to a great extent, been anticipated by Leibnitz in the introduction to his 'Nouveaux Essais sur l'Entendement humain,' which were written in answer to Locke in 1704, and first published by Raspe in 1765. The passage is one of such remarkable acuteness of observation and such masterly eloquence, that we place it before our readers.

'D'ailleurs il y a mille marques qui font juger qu'il y a à tout moment une infinité de perceptions en nous mais sans aperception et sans réflexion; c'est-à-dire des changements dans l'âme même, dont nous ne nous apercevons pas, parceque ces impressions sont ou trop petites et en trop grand nombre, ou trop unies, en sorte qu'elles n'ont rien d'assez distinguant à part; mais jointes à d'autres, elles ne laissent pas de faire leur effet et de se faire sentir dans l'assemblage au moins confusément. . . . Toute attention demande de la mémoire, et quand nous ne sommes point avertis, pour ainsi dire, de prendre garde à quelques-unes de nos propres perceptions présentes, nous les laissons passer sans réflexion et même sans les remarquer; mais si quelqu'un nous en avertit incontinent et nous fait remarquer, par exemple, quelque bruit qu'on vient d'entendre, nous nous en souvenons et nous nous apercevons d'en avoir eu tantôt quelque sentiment. . . . Ces petites perceptions sont donc de plus grand efficace qu'on ne pense. Ce sont elles qui forment ce je ne sais

quoi, ces goûts, ces images des qualités des sens, *claires dans l'assemblage, mais confuses dans les parties* ; ces impressions que les corps qui nous environnent font sur nous et qui enveloppent l'infini ; cette liaison que chaque être a avec tout le reste de l'univers. On peut même dire qu'en conséquence de ces petites perceptions *le présent est plein de l'avenir et chargé du passé* ; que tout est conspirant (*réservez-vous* comme disait Hippocrate), et que dans la moindre des substances, des yeux aussi perçants que ceux de Dieu pourraient lire toute la série des choses de l'univers.

“ Quæ sint, quæ fuerint, quæ mox ventura trahantur.”

... En un mot, les *perceptions insensibles* sont d'un aussi grand usage dans la pneumatique que les corpuscules dans la physique ; et il est également déraisonnable de rejeter les unes et les autres sous prétexte qu'elles sont hors de la portée de nos sens.

There is, however, a wide distinction between these ‘unconscious perceptions’ of Leibnitz and the unconscious functional activity which Dr. Carpenter and some modern writers appear to ascribe to the brain ; for however difficult it may be to analyse and trace to their source the unbidden operations and creative energy of the human mind, the most profound observation of the organs of thought points to faculties of the intellect incomparably beyond them. To borrow another sentence from Leibnitz : —

‘ De plus par le moyen de l’âme ou de la forme, il y a une véritable unité qui répond à ce qu’on appelle moi en nous ; ce qui ne saurait avoir lieu ni dans les machines de l’art ni dans la simple masse de la matière, quelque organisée qu’elle puisse être, qu’on ne peut considérer que comme un étang plein de poissons ou comme une montre composée de ressorts et de roues.’ (*Leibnitz, Système nouveau de la Nature*, § 11.)

Dr. Laycock, now occupying that chair in the University of Edinburgh, to which the names of Cullen, Gregory, and Alison have given such high eminence, has carried his researches deeply into these subjects, and brought under a system of psychology many anomalies which had before perplexed all inquiry into these singular relations of mind and body. We have not room here to comment on the peculiar views contained in Dr. Laycock’s writings, though they may at some future time come under our consideration. We would merely notice at present, in connexion with the subject before us, his striking application of the doctrine of unconscious or automatic mental states to the illustration of the theory of instincts, and even to the spontaneous intuitions of genius which he ranges under the same category. Mozart, when only four years old, wrote music in strict accordance with the rules of musical composition, although he had not been instructed in them. In after life he wrote music, to use

his own phrase, because he could not help it. To the same class of phenomena belong the wonderful calculators, and all the apparent marvels of clairvoyant, hysterical, and somnambulist genius. Sir H. Holland remarks, in his preface, that in the discussion of his subjects he has kept constantly in view 'that great law of continuity which equally governs all mental and material phenomena;' (in this respect being an acute follower of Leibnitz and of Aristotle), adding that no conclusions are more secure, or more profitable, than those drawn from a careful notice of continuous relations, and of those gradations of change which bring extreme cases within common laws, and reconcile anomalies with facts familiar to experience. No better illustration of the value of this 'great law' can be afforded than the doctrines just stated—doctrines which link in a common category the innate knowledge of the mere instinctive animal, the aspirations of genius, and the delirious fantasies of the hysterical and insane. These remarks, very general as they are, must close what we wish to say as to the *agent*. We will now pass to the consideration of the *organ* most closely associated with all the functions of mind.

The study of the anatomy of the brain and nervous system has been rendered much more repulsive than it need be, by the perplexing structural divisions adopted by anatomists. The layman, so soon as he enters upon the study of the structure of the encephalon (or that portion of the nervous system contained within the skull, and which is the principal material organ of thought), encounters the most singular array of uncouth terms. He reads of the corpus callosum, the pes hippocampi, the calamus scriptorius, the floor of the fourth ventricle, the pyramid, the pineal gland, the olivary bodies, and many more terms of the most fanciful meaning; necessary, it is granted, for the anatomist as track-marks, but more embarrassing than instructive to the general student of mental physiology. Apart from this minute and technical anatomy, the structure of the brain and nervous system is easily comprehensible, thanks to the patient labours of numerous microscopic observers, and may be very briefly described. Every bone of the spine is a thick ring; and these bones, when placed upon each other, form not only what is called the vertebral column, but also a canal. Within this strong bony canal is placed the spinal cord—*medulla*, or marrow, in popular phrase,—which is continuous upwards with the brain, and downwards with the nerves going off to the limbs and trunk. The brain and this spinal cord constitute the great centres of all sensorial and motive action; hence they are termed the 'cerebro-spinal axis.' It is in and by and through this axis

that the mind operates and receives the impressions of the senses; and its various channels of communication with the external world are the multitudinous nerves of motion and sensation which, passing off in innumerable and microscopically minute fibrils from the axis, ramify over the whole surface of the body, and penetrate every muscular fibre.

Anatomical research shows that although there *may* be one centre, the special seat of consciousness, to which all impressions pass (designated by older writers the common sensory), yet there are smaller centres of action which are not necessarily the seat of consciousness, but in which is seated a sort of unconscious intelligence—or, we should rather term it, instinctive perception and volition—to regulate the muscles and viscera adaptively. These are termed ganglia, being *knot-like* structures situate on the nerves. All the centres are of the same general structure as these; that is, they are ganglionic, and made up of 'white' and 'grey' matter or tissue—a fact easily observed by slicing the brain of a sheep. The white portion, like the nerves, is made up of fibrils, whose function is that of the telegraphic wires—that is, they are fibrils of communication; the grey matter is made up of very minute hollow globules, corpuscles, vesicles, or 'cells,' collected in masses, containing little grains or nuclei, and surrounded by a large number of blood-vessels. These cells appear to be the seat of action in the brain, and in the spinal cord and ganglia they are the source of adapted motions and other functions appropriate to the wants of the animal. In some parts of the body this cell-structure is found far away from the great seat of thought and will, connected only by communicating fibrils; in this case, the latter are the nerves of sensation, and the cell-structure constitutes a part of a special organ adapted to receive impressions from without. Of this kind is the retina, spread out on the back chamber of the eye, and connected with the brain by the optic nerve; so also the auditory nerve is spread out on the beautiful bony mechanism of the ears. Virtually, then, the brain is *prolonged* by these communicating fibrils to the eye, the ear, the nose, the mouth, the skin. It is in virtue of this arrangement, that if a leg has been amputated, and the trunk of the communicating fibrils which still remain in the stump be irritated, pain is felt as if the amputated foot itself were the seat of the injury; and thus the sufferer may apparently, and to his own feelings, experience pain in a limb, the constituent elements of which have been long scattered to the four winds. And this is the case with all the senses; impressions made on the communicating fibrils excite

the same idea of *outness* as if the very nerve-cell itself had been touched, which is the sentinel of the intelligent principle within. Thus it is that deaf people hear, as it were, the ringing of bells, the whistling of the wind, the roar of cataracts—thus it is that the blind see flashes of light, brilliant colours, and phantasms of wondrous variety—thus it is that abominable odours oppress the sense of smell when that sense is abolished, and bitterness is felt when nought bitter touches the palate.

As we do not propose to write a formal dissertation on the anatomy and physiology of the nervous system, we have said enough for our readers to understand some of the effects of that wonderful reciprocity of action of body and mind which it is the province of mental physiology to explain. Amongst the most interesting of these are 'the effects of mental attention on bodily organs'—to which subject Sir H. Holland devotes a chapter. A right knowledge of these constitutes a key to the understanding of all those remarkable, but by no means inexplicable, phenomena, designated mesmeric, electro-biological, magnetic, spiritualistic, &c.,—all which are purely natural, and exceptional in no respect whatever to those who comprehend the principles of mental physiology.

Let us revert to the *agent* in mental phenomena, and inquire, with Sir Henry Holland, what is meant by the act of mind termed *attention*. It is the direction of the consciousness by voluntary effort, or otherwise, to particular organs and parts of the body. It is the mind trying to know and become cognisant of states of the organism through its telegraphic communications and outposts. Now the consciousness may be thus directed by a distinct act of the will, or independently of the will, and be induced by sensations derived from the part, or by some mental state having reference to the part, but equally independent of volition. When thus directed, an act of attention may and will induce in many persons changes in the physical condition and functions of the part to which it is directed.

Sir H. Holland was one of the first in recent times (1839) to direct the attention of physiologists and physicians to this curious phenomenon, and it will be interesting to note some of the illustrations he gives. There are good grounds for the opinion that the action of the heart is often quickened or otherwise disturbed by the mere centring the consciousness upon it, independently of any emotion or anxiety. Stimulated attention will frequently give a local sense of arterial pulsation where not previously felt, and create or augment those singing and rushing noises in the ears, which probably depend on the circulation through the capillary vessels. A concentration of

the consciousness on the stomach creates a sensation of weight, oppression, or other less definite uneasiness. It is thus the dyspeptic aggravates his symptoms by the constant and earnest direction of his mind to the digestive organs, and the functions going on in them. Feelings of nausea may be produced or greatly increased in this way, and are often suddenly relieved by the attention being directed to other objects. So, if a person directs his attention to the act of swallowing, it instantly becomes embarrassing; or if he be a stammerer, and is suddenly reminded of his infirmity, vain are the struggles to get out his words. Sir Henry Holland points out that it is in this way the homoeopathic observer falls into error. He commences a 'proving,' that is, the observation of the effects of remedies, by taking an incalculably small molecule of some material, as chalk or charcoal, usually believed by common experience to be inert, and vigorously sets his attention to work to detect its operation on various parts of his body. Sensations and functional disturbances occur in obedience to these reiterated acts of directed consciousness, and a catalogue of symptoms is quickly produced, amounting sometimes to hundreds. The attention urged to seek for local sensations has no difficulty in finding them; nay, they generate one another, and are often excited by the mere expectation that they will occur.

In the experiments also of the mesmeric philosopher there is identically the same source of error, with this difference, that the attention of the subject is directed to the parts affected by the manipulations of the mesmeriser, and not by his own processes of thought. Very many years ago, Sir H. Holland had his mind directed to this point when witnessing some mesmeric experiments made by the late Mr. Chenevix. These experiments, made on two young girls, had the effect of inducing various sensations—heat, weight, or inability of motion—in any limb to which the attention was expressly solicited by mesmeric means applied; and by the questions asked. The proof as to the real nature of the causes concerned was afforded by the repetition of the experiments, with the *show* of the same means applied (a mere slip of paper placed by the mesmeriser upon the limb), but with nothing actually done. The effect was precisely the same as before in the description of sensations produced; and this result was obtained repeatedly, with little variation. The operation of Perkins's metallic tractor illustrates this law.

In late years these phenomena have given rise to phrenology, mesmerism, odium, rhabdomy, chorea, and the like. Not understanding the physiology and pathology

of the nervous system, merely perceiving a certain amount of reality in the phenomena induced, stimulated by the opposition and scoffs of unreasoning sceptics, — the supporters of these various delusions have plunged from one depth of error to a lower deep, and thence to a lower still, until settled insanity or monomania, or the wildest eccentricity, has ended their course of experimental inquiry. Theirs has been the fate of Phaeton: thinking in their ignorance that they could guide an inquiry into the deepest mysteries of human nature, the subject has overmastered their weak intellects and hurled them headlong.

‘Ibant obscuri solâ sub nocte per umbram
Perque domos Ditis vacuas, et inania regna.’

It is part of the great scheme of Divine Providence that animals endowed with the power of vision shall use the eyes given to them to exercise that power; it is equally a part of that great and wondrous scheme that the brain and nervous system shall be the organs of thought. It is for this purpose solely they have been so exquisitely constructed. If, then, men set themselves to prove, and passionately insist that their arguments be heard, that there is in the ordinary course of nature vision without eyes, and *manifest* mental phenomena independently of that most cunning and most marvellous piece of organic mechanism in the universe, the human brain, they have taken leave of their best guide, common sense.

Whatever changes the nerves undergo in relation to consciousness the brain itself will undergo. Hence it is that just as the functional activity of the nerves may be altered mesmerically, and changes in motion, sensation, and nutrition follow, so also may the brain; and all those morbid conditions may result which are found in diseases in which the function and not the structure of the brain is modified. The most common and the most typical of this class of changes is that which occurs in sleep. In reference to this singularly mysterious phase of mental life, Sir Henry Holland advances views of great practical importance; for if the true nature of sleep and dreaming be understood, the key is acquired to every possible variety of disorder of ‘ideation,’ from the simplest maniacal delirium to the wildest ecstasy of the clairvoyant, the Pythonissa, or the *ecstatica*. Sir Henry is of opinion that sleep is not a unity of state, but a series and succession of states, ever varying from moment to moment. These variations are of every degree of diversity, from complete wakefulness to the most perfect sleep of which we have cognisance. Yet, even in the latter condition, fleeting changes may be, and

are, presented to the consciousness as dreams, so that no state of sleep is without them. That they are not remembered is no proof that they have not occurred, for we constantly forget our dreams. To argue otherwise is to argue for the annihilation, in fact, for a time, of all that is not merely organic life; a condition absolutely antagonistic to all the phenomena of mental life.

Dreams cannot, however, be studied apart from other analogous conditions of the mind. In the insane we have acts which are simply the result of acted dreams, and in the delirium of intoxication or fever we have the same condition from different causes. These constitute, as Sir Henry Holland tersely remarks, *the great mines* of mental discovery open to us. It is from the study and observation of these groups of phenomena, in connexion with more evanescent changes, that we can attain to a just theory of madness. The law of continuity of phenomena is specially useful as a guide through this labyrinth of contradictory facts and conclusions.

'I know' of no principle so capable of affording it as that which views all the forms of insanity, including delirium, in their relation to corresponding healthy states of mind; tracing this connexion through these intermediate grades, which are so numerous exposed to us in the various conditions of human existence. The diversities of the mind in what is accounted its healthy state, — the effect of passions in suddenly altering its whole condition, of slighter emotions in gradually changing it, and of other incidents of life in affecting one or more particular faculties, — its subjection periodically to sleep, and casually to the states of intoxication, somnambulism, and reverie; — its gradual transition in fever from a state where there is consciousness of vague and wandering ideas to that of perfect delirium, — all these furnish so many passages through which we may follow sanity into insanity, and connect the different forms of disordered intellect, as well with each other as with the more natural and healthy functions of the mind.'

Before entering more particularly into these conditions, let us inquire into the state of the consciousness in dreaming.

In dreams the most remarkable characteristic of consciousness is, that through all the continuous states, through all the phantasmagoria (which pass, as we have seen, in rapid succession), however absurd the idea, however monstrous the conclusions, the reality and verity of the states are never doubted, except in those apparently exceptional instances, in which there is so much of true mental state that the patient suspects, or in incorrect popular phrase, 'dreams' that he is dreaming. How is this question to be answered? Whatever change in the brain is presented to the consciousness, no matter what kind it may

be, a change in the mental state is induced, and that change is believed to be real. Running parallel with the series of changes in the consciousness there is a concurrent series of changes in the cell structure of the nervous system equally rapid, equally successional; and it is the sum-total of these in any given time which constitute the material link between the spiritual and the physical. Deeper we cannot penetrate. Normally, at every inlet to the sensorium the excitants of the sensorium pour in, — now by the ear, now by the eye, now by the smell or the touch, or from the wide-spread inner surfaces. Each of these would, separately, develop erroneous ideas or perceptions, but one corrects the other. ‘Erroneous states of consciousness probably occur,’ Dr. Laycock remarks, ‘at many moments of our waking lives; not one of our senses is to be depended upon; but there is a preordained mutual control and correction of each other in healthy action which is destroyed in dreaming and other abnormal states of the cerebrum.’ And why? Simply because the inlets of knowledge are acting imperfectly; the external senses are partially or wholly shut; there is no perception of locality or of surrounding things; and so the mere phantasmagorial succession of cerebral changes is presented to the consciousness without that direction and correction which in the waking normal state they perpetually undergo. This explanation applies to every form of erroneous conviction dependent upon *sensorial* changes. We say *sensorial*, because the *motor* portion of the system is more or less paralysed in sleep and dreams, and the will which controls the functions of the waking mind is entirely, or almost entirely, suspended. This exclusion of sensations from without varies indefinitely even in the soundest sleep.

‘It varies presumably at every moment of time,’ Sir Henry Holland remarks, ‘and not only as to the degree in which the general power of perception is present, but even as to the ratio of impression from different organs. One sense, in the plainest meaning of the expression, may be more asleep than another. In dreams this exclusion of external sensations is generally more complete than in madness, or the ordinary state of intoxication; and here, accordingly, the *excursions* of aberration appears to be widest.’

Cicero says, and justly, that if it had been so ordered by nature that we should actually do in sleep all we dream, every man would have to be bound down before going to bed: — ‘*Majores enim, quam ulli insani, efficerent motus somniantes.*’

We have seen what grand imagery and strange phantasms may be seen in sleep; all men know how argumentative, how poetic, how musical, how brilliant they may be in their slumbers.

But in the waking state also these things may take possession of the consciousness, and are then known as *spectral* or delirious illusions. There may be, and indeed are, illusions of every sense, not spectra only, or *visual* illusions, but auditory also, as when 'airy tongues syllable men's names;' or olfactory, when odious scents haunt the sufferer; or tactile, as when it is felt as if ants or other insects were creeping here and there on the skin. Of all these, the visual and the auditory are the most interesting, because they are not only of the most frequent occurrence, but they most frequently lead to mistaken conclusions and acts. They are the staple of all tales of magic and witchcraft, of the marvels of odyism, electrobiology, mesmerism, and have even led to great religious movements and epidemical excitements.

'While connected on the one hand,' as our author remarks, 'with dreaming, delirium, and insanity, they are related on the other, by a series of gradations, with the most natural and healthy functions. From the recollected images of objects of sense which the volition, rationally exercised, places before our consciousness for the purposes of thought, and which the reason duly separates from the realities around us, we have a gradual transition, under different states of the sensorium, to those spectral images or illusions which come unbidden into the mind, dominate alike over the senses and reason, and, either by their intensity, or duration, produce disorder in the intellectual functions, and in all the actions depending thereon.'

In illustration of the strange and complex character of these phenomena, Sir Henry mentions a faculty (often tried experimentally by himself) which the mind occasionally exercises, of modifying, by a sort of voluntary effort, the spectral images which come involuntarily before the perception when the eyes are closed. An outline, or figure, having some likeness to a face, may often by a certain effort be more closely assimilated to it, and the supplementary features made to stand out as if at our bidding. These kind of images will come involuntarily before the mind. We well remember how when prostrate on a bed of sickness the large flickering shadows of things thrown on the wall of the room opposite to us by the watcher's dim candle, gradually assumed the outline of grotesque gigantic human forms, and remained perfect so long as we passively looked at them, but were resolved into their elements the moment the attention was fixed upon them. So also the folds of the coverlet gradually assumed the appearance of figures sculptured from the whitest Parian,—beautifully chaste and classic female forms, excelling apparently the finest works of Greek art, until, rising to look more curiously at them, the whole array of beauty vanished.

Sometimes, however, the contrary happens, and these spectral images intrude themselves so forcibly that they cannot be put aside, although the person is fully awake, and conscious of the presence of illusion. Sir H. Holland has met with many remarkable examples of this disorder, and more than one case confirming that recorded by Dr. Abercrombie, in which the patient, though creating the illusion by an effort of the will, had no equal power of removing it. He could call up the ghost, but exorcise it he could not.

These illusions are connected with other facts of singular interest and of great practical importance. We have seen: how acts of attention will develop sensations and movements and changes of function in the so-called mesmeric and electrobiological phenomena, and in the homœopathic practice. Similar excited acts of attention will also develop these sensuous illusions, only the operator *suggests* to the subject the set of ideas upon which the illusion is to be based. Sometimes the suggestion is made directly, as when the electrobiologist distinctly tells his 'medium' that he cannot do such and such a thing; or that a given object is sweet, or is bitter, and the like. More frequently the suggestion arises indirectly in a consecutive chain or association of ideas. The singular results of *suggestion*, as seen in the so-called electrobiological phenomena, may be varied with suitable 'subjects' in every possible way. That curious change of personal identity, for example, so characteristic of dreaming and of insanity, may be induced. In one instance, two young ladies, the one married the other single, were made to change identities. One of these ladies was told that she was to go to sleep the next day at one o'clock, at which hour the operator would not fail to mesmerise her. He forgot all about it; but a minute or two after the clock struck one, the subject was sound asleep. In these instances there was no belief in mesmerism by the operator; it was simply an experiment made by a physiologist to determine the real influence of suggestion.

The class of spectral illusions suggested by associated ideas in 'sensitives,' — that is, persons predisposed by cerebral excitability, — is well illustrated by the dagger scene in 'Macbeth.' Familiar as the lines are, they acquire a fresh interest from their astonishing analysis of the most subtle mental phenomena.

Is this a dagger which I see before me,

The handle toward my hand? Come, let me clutch thee: —

I have thee not, and yet I see thee still.

Art thou not, fatal vision, sensible

To feeling, as to sight? Or art thou but

A dagger of the mind: a false creation,

Proceeding from the heat-oppressed brain ?
 I see thee yet, in form as palpable
As this which now I draw.
Thou marshal'st me the way that I was going,
And such an instrument I was to use.
 Mine eyes are made the fools o' the other senses,
 Or else work all the rest. I see thee still ;
 And on the blade and dudgeon gouts of blood,
 Which was not so before. There's no such thing ;
It is the bloody business which informs
Thus to mine eye.'

This is an exquisite piece of psychological painting. The sleepless excited murderer thinks of his weapon—and the spectral illusion of the dagger appears ; then of his going to do the deed—and it 'marshals' him onwards ; then of the deed done—and the dagger is dropping with blood.

A Baron von Reichenbach has laboured, experimentally, for years, and published a thick volume, illustrated with plates, containing the results of a long-continued series of researches, from which the inference is drawn, that there is a force in nature, not hitherto recognised, termed Odyle. It proceeds from different sources, and to avoid circumlocution the Baron designates its varieties after these,—'crystallodyle,' 'thermodyle,' 'electrodyle,' 'photodyle,' 'magnetodyle,' 'chemodyle,' 'heliodyle,' and for the whole material universe (these experimentalists set no limits to their ambition) 'pantodyle' ! The sole basis of this grand fabric of philosophy, devised by a philosopher who believes that he is going deeper than ever plummet sounded, is nothing more than the suggested visual phantasmata as to phosphorescent light of a dozen or two hysterical men and women. Any one can make the experiment for himself. Let him take an excitable, imaginative young girl ; let him from day to day work on her imagination ; let him by constant excitation of the sensorial organ—the cerebrum, render her 'sensitive,' or a 'medium,' to use the cant phrase of the spiritualists and odylists,—and he will make her see the 'odylic' light in an empty hair-trunk, and a universe of starry lights in a band-box.

When these phenomena are induced in a number of persons at once, the most grotesque and extraordinary notions will spread through society. Let the superstitious and credulous only *believe* that a sacred picture moves its motionless eyes, and crowds to whom the phenomenon is thus suggested, will, as they think, indubitably see it. And who can gainsay such abundant evidence of eye-witnesses ? Thus, also, is it with spirit-rapping. Listening believingly, the devotee hears illusory sounds ; for it is quite true that in a certain proportion of spirit-

rapping experiments there is no attempt at wilful deception — the whole process being one of excited auditory illusions. The grandest effect of all is produced when the operator can influence by vapours or drugs the sensory organs of an audience already constitutionally fitted for the purpose, and thereby develop, artificially and quickly, an extreme sensitiveness in the whole assembly. Under these circumstances there are no scenes so monstrous, so extraordinary, so supernatural, that may not be suggested to the imaginations of the audience.

All these startling phenomena may thus, then, be reconciled with the principles of mental physiology. They are simply the phenomena of a temporary, artificially excited state of mental aberration — nothing more. But in insanity itself there is something deeply interesting, and, to the uninformed mind, awfully terrible and mysterious. It is a disease still invested in the East with a supernatural character, and linked by its nature and origin with the spiritual world.

Every one knows how largely spectral illusions enter into the phenomena of acute or violent mania, delirium tremens, and the like. The auditory illusions are more frequent in the milder forms; and sometimes in monomania the words uttered are received as communications from the Almighty. In cases of this kind the habits of thought of the individual very frequently suggest the words spoken. Instances of insanity are common 'in which,' Sir Henry Holland remarks, 'the patient is so strongly affected by imagined voices, as to produce on his part earnest or passionate rejoinder. I have known these delusions of hearing such, in a case of delirium tremens, that the patient held a long and angry colloquy with an imaginary person whom he supposed (there being no deception of sight) in an adjoining room. He allowed pauses to intervene, while his opponent might be presumed to be speaking; yet, amidst all this, answered, immediately and with correctness, every question put to himself.' In another case of mental derangement, recorded in our author's notes, the patient held frequent and exciting conversations, in which he sometimes professed to hear the answers given to him; at other times bore both parts himself, but in different tones of voice for each of the supposed parties engaged.

The purely cerebral origin of these illusions is well-illustrated by another case detailed by Sir H. Holland, in which an aged gentleman experienced, on the third day after a fall, the singular *lusus* of two voices, seemingly close to the ear, in rapid dialogue, or rather repetition of phrases, unconnected with any event of present occurrence, and almost without meaning. The

subject of this illusion described himself as being perfectly aware of its fallacious nature, but at the same time wholly unable to check or withdraw the perception of these voices, or to change the phrases they seemed to utter. There was no nervousness on his part, but rather amusement in the strangeness of the phenomenon, and the absurdity of the speeches to which he felt himself listening. When trying to read, similar voices seemed to accompany him, as if reading aloud; sometimes getting on a few words in advance, but not beyond what the eye might have reached; sometimes substituting totally different words; the whole having the effect of distinct speech from without, and being entirely beyond the control of the will.

What is the state of the cerebrum in sleep? There is no change in the structure, else the condition would not be evanescent. The change is in *function*, and in the function of the cells probably. We know well what drugs will induce the state that mimics sleep, and we know what injuries will have the same effect. If there be compression or pressure of the cerebral structure in sufficient degree, the individual is as motionless and unconscious as in the deepest slumber, and often snores as loudly. These are the 'coma' and 'stertor' of the apoplectic fit. There seems reason to think that the condition of the blood has some relation to sleep, for it is found that respiration of such an impure atmosphere as is caused by a crowded assembly or by numerous lights causes slumber. Then the cell-structures themselves—the structures in which all those vital changes go on which are correlative with the phenomena of life and consciousness—cannot perform their functions continuously and unremittingly and at the same time healthily. To the latter there is required such a period of rest from action as is necessary for proper nutrition; this being in fact the law with regard to the more mechanical organs, as the senses and the muscles. The access of healthy blood is no doubt requisite to healthy action, but the reparation of the waste undergone by the organ is necessary too. Sleep then is the result of, at least, two converging series of phenomena.

The uses of sleep are well illustrated by Sir Benjamin Brodie:—

'A gentleman of my acquaintance,' he writes, 'in whose family circumstances had occurred which were to him a source of intense anxiety, passed six days and nights without sleep. At the end of this time he became affected with illusions of such a nature that it was necessary to place him in confinement. After some time he recovered perfectly. He had never shown any signs of mental derangement before, nor had any one of his family, and he has never since been similarly affected.'

This is manifestly an extreme case; but in accordance with the law of continuity, all intermediate degrees of irregular mental action may be found under almost all varieties. The temper and disposition will be changed. Many a person who, under ordinary circumstances, is cheerful and unsuspicious, becomes not only irritable and peevish, but (as Sir B. Brodie remarks) also labours under actual though transitory delusions; such, for example, as thinking others neglect him, or affront him, who have not the smallest intention of doing either the one or the other. Even spectral illusions will be induced, and in illustration Sir B. Brodie quotes his own experience. 'I have sometimes, when I have been writing late at night, and much fatigued, so that I could scarcely fix my attention on the thing before me, feelings as if my head were almost too large to contain it.' Excessive use of the brain, as in study, or excessive activity, as in emotional excitement, induces a condition not widely dissimilar from that which want of sleep induces; but when to this excessive use and activity there is superadded, as an effect, an incapacity for rest, a terrible catastrophe is surely impending, and happy is the man if judicious advice saves him his reason. There can be no question that cerebral exhaustion, whether it be the result of imperfect nutrition of the tissue, or imperfect aëration, (as when a foul atmosphere is breathed for a lengthened period), or of sleeplessness or of over-work, or of over-excitement from passions and emotions of a depressing character, is one of the most efficient, if not actually the preeminent, cause of drunkenness as well as insanity,—the feeling of exhaustion which is experienced being most relieved by alcoholic stimuli, and which, in truth, are craved instinctively, and therefore urgently.

One curious and singularly instructive illustration of these principles is given by Sir H. Holland, and is characteristic of his practical method of discussion. It is this: that the too frequent and earnest direction of the mind inwards upon itself—the concentration of the consciousness too long continued upon its own functions—is sufficient to produce a temporary derangement in minds already predisposed to the infirmity. Sir Henry Holland has known more than one instance, of aberration of intellect which he had every reason to think had been thus produced. It is very probable that the analogous operation induced by 'mesmerising' is more frequently than is generally suspected, followed by similar results.

'On the Memory as affected by Age and Disease,' is a chapter in *Mental Physiology* which includes some of the most curious phenomena which come under the notice of the physician.

Perhaps no mental disorder is so conclusive of bodily derangement as loss of memory. Let the reader take the following illustrations from Sir H. Holland:—

“A case of slight paralytic affection is at this time before me, where the perception from the senses are unimpaired; the memory of persons and events seemingly correct; the intelligence only slightly affected; the bodily functions, though feeble in power, not otherwise disordered; but where the memory of words for speech is so nearly gone, that only the single monosyllable “yes” remains as the sole utterance of all that the patient desires to express. Even when a single negative is obviously intended, no other word is used. In another case of recent occurrence, where, in sequel to a paralytic attack two years before, the memory of words had been greatly confused and impaired, I found them all regained and brought into light except the pronouns; which were almost invariably displaced and substituted one for another. In a third case, where the patient affected with hemiplegia at a very advanced age, passed into a state of low rambling delirium, a few days before his death, all that he uttered, whether in answer or otherwise, was in French, a language he had not been known to speak at any time for thirty years before. This continued until his utterance ceased to be intelligible altogether.

This latter phenomenon is amongst the most common, yet the most inexplicable, of the phenomena of memory. The tenacity of memory in the age for facts and circumstances of early life, and the total inability to remember present circumstances from day to day, are matters of common observation. So also in the dying is seen this recollection of the days and scenes, and even ideas, of childhood and youth.

Sir Henry Holland passes in rapid review the various states, corporeal and mental, in which the memory fails. Amongst the most practically important of these is the failure of memory from undue exercise of the mind. The system which prematurely forces the youthful intellect is strongly and justly reprehended by our author.

‘It is a fact, well attested by experience, that the memory may be seriously, sometimes lastingly injured, by pressing upon it too hardly and continuously in early life. Whatever theory we hold as to this great function of our nature, it is certain that its powers are only gradually developed; and that if forced into premature exercise, they are impaired by the effort. This is a maxim indeed of general import, applying to the condition and culture of every faculty of body and mind; but singularly to the one we are now considering, which forms in one sense the foundation of intellectual life. A regulated exercise, short of actual fatigue, enlarges its capacity both as to reception and retention; and gives promptitude as well as clearness to its action. But we are bound to refrain from

goaded it by constant and laborious efforts in early life, and before the instrument has been strengthened to its work, or it decays under our hands.'

Loss of memory is one of the earliest symptoms of incipient disease of the brain: perhaps it is the first trustworthy symptom. No man who has much intellectual labour, much mental anxiety, or who has in any way cause to think the brain has been overtasked or injured, should neglect this warning. It is a warning the more valuable because it is given at a time when rest and medical treatment can do much to remove the incipient disease. Being an early symptom, it necessarily follows that loss of memory *accompanies* numerous cerebral disorders. That change which is known as 'softening' is specially characterised by loss of memory. 'A certain vague wandering of the recollection often occurs as the first indication of the disease; whilst its progress is attended with increasing incapacity, either for receiving new impressions, or recalling and embracing those of earlier date. Paralytic diseases, frequent epileptic seizures, mania in many forms, are amongst the most common diseases in which the change in the memory is constant.'

We cannot close our consideration of some of the more salient facts and principles of mental physiology without reference to that fertile source of knowledge which the instincts and habits of the lower animals afford. Many of the human mental conditions we have glanced at are seen also in them. They sleep, they dream, they become insane. They have also intermediate states between these. They have their variations in temper as man has. The horse will weep like his master, and the big tears course as rapidly down his cheeks from grief and pain. In *rabies* the mental character of the horse is wonderfully changed. If before the attack of the disease he had been naturally good-tempered and attached to his rider or his groom, he will recognise his former friend and seek his *caresses* during the intervals between the paroxysms of fury, and he will bend on him one of those piteous, searching looks which once observed will never be forgotten. Mr. Youatt attended a horse in *rabies*, and remarks: 'He would bend his gaze upon me, as if he would search me through and through, and would prexail on me, if I could, to relieve him from some dreadful evil by which he was threatened. He would then press his head against my bosom, and keep it there for a minute or more.' Yet in the paroxysms this touching desire for sympathy and solace would change (and that almost instantaneously) into the most maddened fury, or else the most singular

trenchery. There is the desire for mischief for its own sake, and there is frequently the artful stratagem to allure the victim within his reach. Not a motion is made by the bystander of which the rabid horse is not conscious, nor does a person approach whom he does not recognise; but he labours under one all-absorbing feeling—an intense longing to devastate and destroy.

In common with all inquirers into mental physiology, the writers before us have discussed this great question of mind as displayed in the instincts and habits of animals; a subject on which much diversity of opinion exists. While fully admitting the fact that the operations of intelligence in lower animals are the same *in kind* as those of man; and, farther, that the instincts of man, where we can truly distinguish them, are the same in principle of operation as those of other animals, Sir H. Holland nevertheless adds, that 'we can adopt no definition of instinct and reason which does not indicate their separate nature.' On the other hand, Sir Benjamin Brodie is 'inclined to believe that the minds of the inferior animals are essentially of the same nature with that of the human race, and that of those various and ever-changing conditions of it, which we term the mental faculties, there are none of which we may not discover traces more or less distinct in other creatures.' Now facts are abundant; for as Sir Henry Holland comprehensively remarks,

'Wherever there is organisation, even under the simplest form, there we are sure to find instinctive action, more or less in amount, destined to give the appropriate effect to it. This is true throughout every part of the animal series, from man and the quadrumana down to the lowest form of infusorial life. When we consider how vast this scale is—crowded with more than a hundred thousand recognised species, exclusively of those which fossil geology has disclosed to us—we may be well amazed by this profuse variety of instinctive action; as multiplied in kind as are the organic forms with which it is associated, and all derived from one common Power.'

This great generalisation includes another; and that is, the community of function of the ultimate constituents, of all these organised beings, in so far as they can be determined. These constituents are microscopically minute hollow spheres of various forms,—oblate, discoid, ovoid, spheroid,—containing small granular bodies termed nuclei. Such, and no other, is that primordial cell from which the perfect organism, whether it be animal, or vegetable, is evolved, and within which operates that unconsciously acting principle of vitality which from so minute and almost formless an atom

of matter, works out the entire mechanism of the frame in all its parts; so that, finally, beauty, fitness, and an admirable working to beneficent ends, is the result. Within the narrow walls of that hollow spheroidal atom is contained, potentially, the whole scheme not only of the future physical life, but also of those instincts, faculties, and peculiarities which are transmitted hereditarily from parent to offspring. If these, then, (and many not mentioned) be the wondrous endowments of these solitary primordial cells; what may we not predicate as to those masses of cells which constitute the effective portion of the brain and nervous system, and which the Great Artificer has predetermined to be the organ of that intelligence which He created in His likeness? Nothing we have said as to their probable functions approaches, we believe, in any degree to the reality. All is only a dim foreshadowing of truths as to the mutual action of mind and matter yet to be discovered.

It is not difficult to say what are the merits and demerits of the works before us. That of Sir B. Brodie is professedly unsystematic. It is essentially a popular work, intended for beginners in the study of mental physiology; and its popularity is manifested by the demand for a third edition. The chapters of Sir H. Holland (as the reader will have seen) take a wider scope, and require more careful reading and more deliberate thought. What will disappoint the popular or hasty reader is one of the great merits of the work; namely, the spirit of cautious inquiry and induction which pervades it, and which leaves certain questions in doubt and unsolved simply because they are, in our present state of knowledge, incapable of solution. 'Persuaded of the truth of the maxim, that it is generally 'shorter and easier to proceed from ignorance to knowledge 'than from error,' Sir Henry remarks, 'I have never scrupled 'to note what I think doubtful or deficient in evidence.'

We think Sir Henry Holland has done well to separate the chapters on Mental Physiology from the contributions to practical medicine with which they were commingled in the first and second editions of his 'Medical Notes and Reflections.' Both are thus improved, as is seen in the third edition of the latter, just published. We need hardly say that these notes and reflections manifest that application of a philosophical method to Medical Art, which the former work offers in reference to Psychology. In all the essays contained in the volume, Sir Henry has successfully endeavoured to avoid mere technicalities, and to place in the clearest form those principles of thought, observation,

and conduct, which may most conduce to the progress of medicine, and the honour and usefulness of those who profess it. In discussing the phenomena of sensation, and the philosophy of sensation derived from them, Sir Henry Holland has never overstrained his own scientific experience, or confounded the physiological truths which lie within the province of the physician, with the proper objects of psychology and the operations of the Reason. Therefore the experience of nearly forty years spent in the honourable service of science and humanity justifies his conclusions; and the volumes of 'Medical Notes and Reflections,' and of 'Physiological Inquiries' before us are examples to be followed by men who have similar opportunities and powers of observation, since they are valuable contributions to our literature and to our knowledge of body and mind.

ART. V.—1. *Conventio inter Sanctitatem Suam Pium IX. Summum Pontificem, et Majestatem Suam Cæsareo-Regiam Apostolicam Franciscum Josephum I., Imperatorem Austriæ, cui subscriptum Viennæ 18va Augusti, 1855.*

2. *Studien über das Oesterreichische Concordat vom 18. August, 1855. Wien: 1856.*

3. *Catholicism in Austria, or an Epitome of Austrian Ecclesiastical Law.* By COUNT FERDINAND DAL POZZO. London: 1827.

4. *The whole Evidence against the Claims of the Roman Church.* By SANDERSON ROBINS, M.A., Rector of St. James's, Dover. London: 1855.

5. *Die Zeichen der Zeit.* Von CHRISTIAN KARL JOSIAS BUNSEN. Leipzig: 1855.

THE Pontificate of Pius IX. has already exhibited to the world a series of vicissitudes hardly to be equalled in the long annals of the Papacy, and of contradictions not to be surpassed in this age of sudden changes and surprising revolutions. For the first time since the death of Ganganeli, Europe hailed the election of a Pontiff to the chair of St. Peter, who addressed himself to popular sympathies, and seemed eager to advance with the liberal progress of the 19th century. He owed his nomination to the blameless parity of his life, and to the influence of the Constitutional Government of France, which was at that time represented in Rome by an ambassador of no common discernment. He was en-

throned in the Church of Santa Maria del Popolo, amidst the veneration of the clergy and the enthusiastic applause of the people. His first actions were calculated to improve the degraded condition of the Roman government in the Papal States, and to vindicate its independence even against the preponderating influence of the Austrian garrisons in Northern Italy. But few months had elapsed after the Pope's accession, when that storm broke loose which convulsed the political fabric of Europe, and unhappily laid low so many of the free institutions of the Continent. At that awful moment, when more powerful sovereigns and more vigorous governments fell in rapid succession before the excited populace of their capitals, the Pope still rode for a time upon the eddies of the stream, and lent his voice to consecrate the cause of Italian liberty and independence.

Prince Metternich declared in his exile that of all the strange and astounding phenomena he had witnessed, that which had surprised him most was 'a liberal Pope.' But the illusion was a brief one. In the reaction which followed that paroxysm of madness, the Roman government was the first to recoil from the task it had undertaken. The revolution, which had been momentarily assisted and controlled by the valour of Charles Albert, and by the adhesion of Pio Nono to the national cause, soon deserted its champions, and turned upon them with as much fury as it had shown against its mortal enemies. The Pope, betrayed by his troops and attacked by his subjects, saw one of his secretaries shot by his side in the Quirinal, whilst his minister, Count Rossi, — a man who combined the loftiest conceptions of a statesman with the most courageous devotion to the cause of his native country, — fell, butchered on the steps of the Cancellaria. Nothing remained but flight, and flight in an ignominious disguise, to an ignominious asylum. Pius IX., who in 1847 had been adored by his people, and applauded by Europe, found himself in 1849 the suppliant of the King of Naples; and it was not till a French army had bombarded the Eternal City from the Janiculum, and placed a garrison in Rome, that the humbled sovereign of the Papal States reentered his dominions. The attempt to ally the ecclesiastical government of the Court of Rome with more enlightened civil institutions has utterly failed. Even the remonstrances and recommendations of Louis Napoleon, whose troops are still mounting guard at the Vatican, whilst he has shown himself in France a devoted son of the Church, have proved unavailing. The Roman government drags on its timorous, cruel, degraded, bankrupt existence, for the motto of its instruments and advisers is still, in the words of a General of the Jesuits, *Sint ut eunt, aut non sint.*

But although these disasters effectually extinguished all hope of the regeneration of the temporal government of the Popes, their effect has been to excite in the mind of Pius IX. a loftier conception of his duties and his powers as the Vicegerent of Christ. That disguised fugitive, who was glad to find a refuge at Gaeta, bore with him an enthusiastic belief in his own spiritual power, and a temper capable of daring and enduring anything for the ascendancy of the Church which he was to govern. To great personal humility and simplicity, heightened by fervent piety and by a strong tinge of superstition, he unites an unbending pride and an incredible arrogance as Head of the Church of Rome; or, if vanity and ambition lurk in his character, as possibly they do, they are artfully concealed under his excess of zeal for the predominance of a spiritual authority more absolute and more universal than Gregory the Great or Innocent III. ever dared to assert. In the hands of this Pope, the pretensions of the Church of Rome have ceased to be matters of historical research or remote speculation. It can no longer be contended that Rome has modified her ancient doctrines on the relations of the temporal and the spiritual power, or that the Papacy had lost any portion of its energy in the long contest with infidelity, with heresy, with the powers of darkness, or with the powers of the world. In the feeble hands of a Leo XII., or a Gregory XVI., the papal authority had indeed appeared to fade away, and greater concessions were made by the liberal spirit of the 19th century to their modesty and their weakness, than could have been extorted by the Roman Pontiffs in the plenitude of their power. But Sixtus when he entered the Conclave leaning on his crutch, was not more different from Sixtus when the voices of that Conclave had crowned him with the tiara, than the Pope under whom Catholic Emancipation was granted by the British Parliament in 1829, and the Pope who presumed to establish a new Catholic hierarchy in Britain in 1850. The Pope everywhere asserts the unqualified supremacy of the spiritual to the temporal power in all the transactions throughout the world in which, according to his own judgment, the interests of the Church are, or may appear to be, concerned. The great principle of the divine commission of the Roman Pontiff to legislate, to judge, and administer in the Church of Christ throughout the world, with absolute and undivided power, being once established and believed, Pius IX. has done no more than follow out that mission to its logical consequences.

Henceforth the war was to be carried on within the territories of the enemy, and the enemy was every power that refused

entire obedience to the claims of Rome. Even in countries where a principle of mutual toleration and good understanding had been long established between the Church of Rome and the State, the power of the priesthood challenged and defied the power of the government. In Ireland, Dr. Cullen was appointed to the Catholic Primacy in opposition to the known wishes of the British Cabinet, and the Queen's Colleges were condemned by the Vatican. In France, after a protracted struggle, public education was once more wrested from the University, and restored to the priests ; the priests have repudiated the traditions of the Gallican Church, and are sunk to a state of bigoted dependence on Rome, which even the ministers of Charles X. would have disavowed.* In Belgium, the clergy have unscrupulously abused the liberty they enjoy, to embarrass the government and to mislead the nation. In Piedmont and in Spain, the reaction has been so violent against the outrageous pretensions of the Papal Power, that those Catholic States are under the ban of Rome. In England, the Papal aggression of 1850 revived passions which had slumbered for more than half a century ; and in Holland, the same interference with the internal affairs of a free people was followed by a similar result. Even in the United States, opposition to the encroaching policy of Rome has become the symbol and the aim of a great political party. Throughout Germany a conflict is raging to which we shall presently address ourselves more closely. These are not the results of any transient gust of fanaticism : on the contrary, the tendency of men's minds in this age lay rather to the extreme of toleration ; and Rome would have been unmolested, had she not assumed the offensive in this warfare. But Pius IX. has disdained to acquiesce in the contemptuous tolerance of the last generation for the obsolete pretensions of the Papacy ; he has proceeded to assert and to enforce them ; he has not scrupled to hold language as imperious as ever fell from the Roman See ; he has attempted to realise the loftiest conception of the Papacy as the head of the Universal Church, by raising it far above that feeble conclave of Italian priests who monopolised its honours and extinguished its power. The Princes of the Church are once more its ardent and energetic representatives in the Courts of France and of Germany, and even in the popular assemblies of schisma-

* Thirty years ago M. de Frayssinous, Bishop of Hermopolis, and First Almoner of Charles X., was a defender of the liberties of the Gallican Church ; in 1856 the Cardinal Archbishop of Bordeaux is ready to condemn the opinions of Bossuet.

tical England. All nations, from the frontiers of Thibet and the most distant islands of the Pacific to the great cities of Europe, are to be brought within the comprehensive fold of the Vicar of Christ. The entire militant forces of Rome are led into the field. The organisation of that stupendous body of docile and devoted agents was never more complete, never more united. Confident in the vigour of his authority and the absolute obedience of his servants, Pius IX. has, without any regular convocation of the members of the Church, and by a novel excess of the Papal jurisdiction, assumed and exercised the power to add an article of faith to the belief of the Latin Church; and that upon a subject so mysterious, so inscrutable, and so entirely contrary to the language of Scripture, that it divided the casuists of the Middle Ages, and that no Pontiff and no Council for upwards of eighteen hundred years had dared to impose it upon the credulity of the faithful. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, authoritatively propounded by the Pope in 1854, raises another and an impassable barrier between the freedom of the mind and the authority of the Church, between the truth of the Gospel and the dogmas of Rome.

We have said enough in these rapid allusions to events which must be familiar to all our readers, to describe the vast scope of the policy which has constantly animated, during the present Pontificate, the whole body of the Romish clergy: we shall illustrate what we have to say on the tendency of this policy by a more minute examination of its latest and most striking achievement in the conclusion of the Austrian Concordat. But ere we proceed, we trust that it is unnecessary for us to disclaim those motives of bigotry and intolerance which sometimes animate the antagonists of Rome. As long as we thought that the members of the Church of Rome, being subjects of the British Crown, did not enjoy that equality of religious toleration and those civil privileges which are the birthright of every Englishman, this Journal was not slow to defend the cause of what was then an oppressed class of our countrymen. But the same spirit which converted the liberal party of this country into the temporary allies of a Church whose tenets we repudiate and whose principles of government we abhor, when that Church appeared to labour under unjust disabilities, now animates us with tenfold force when we see that Church endeavouring to impose unjust disabilities on others; when we find that the specious pretext of liberty of conscience is converted into an engine of ecclesiastical domination; when we observe that the first principles of national independence are trampled upon by the ubiquitous encroachments of a foreign Power; when we

know that the darkest contrivances of mediæval superstition, and the execrable tyranny of the Inquisition itself, are once more set in motion to thwart the progress of society, to crush the growth of freedom, and to emasculate the mind of man. We write not as Protestants only, not as schismatics, not as mere opponents of a creed or a system of Church government. If we were members of the Church of Rome itself, our indignation would not be less intense to see the inordinate excess of the Papal authority which these latter times have witnessed, to the detriment of the ancient and fundamental rights of the Church. Our ancestors were devout Catholics when they passed the Constitutions of Clarendon under Henry II., the statute of Provisors under Edward III., and the great statute of Præmunire under Richard II. The Council of Constance undoubtedly represented the whole Christian Church of Western Europe, when it asserted, with the full authority of that great assembly, what Mr. Hallam has well termed 'the Whig principles of the Catholic Church,' and opposed the legal resistance of the national episcopate to the absolute dominion of the See of Rome. Bossuet and the French Bishops were not less devout Catholics when they unanimously subscribed the immortal Declaration of 1682. It matters comparatively little to us, as Protestants, to what pitch of extravagance the Papal authority may be carried. Perhaps, indeed, some may desire that a system so adverse to everything we hold dear should exhaust its powers of oppression, and sow the seeds of a more formidable reaction against itself. But the future reaction is no diminution of the present evil. This conspiracy against the liberty and independence of mankind is gaining ground—rapidly in some foreign countries, partially even in our own. It becomes, therefore, a paramount duty to oppose, as far as we are able, the progress of so great an evil, and to show by a most forcible example that the middle of the 19th century has conceded a triumph to the Papal power which the Papal Power in the 13th century scarcely dared to claim, which the civil rulers of the 14th century withheld, and which no intervening age from that time to the present would have endured.

It would carry us beyond the limits of this article if we attempted to follow the long series of encroachments by which the authority of Rome was extended, and the system of ecclesiastical domination established over a great part of Europe. The historical evidence of this steady and unpromising resistance of Rome to the rights of every political society, and to the independence of every national Church,

has been traced with consummate acuteness and accuracy in the chapter which Mr. Hallam devotes to this subject in his 'History of the Middle Ages'; and more recently by Dean Milman, in his able and comprehensive 'History of Latin Christianity,' a work which deserves to occupy a permanent and conspicuous place in our literature, and to which we hope ere long to devote a more extended notice. The claims of the Romish Church, more especially with reference to the Papal Supremacy, have also been ably and dispassionately treated by the Rev. Sanderson Robins, the title of whose volume we have prefixed to this article, and we may safely recommend it as a convenient summary of the historical evidence in the case. No subject in the annals of mankind has been more copiously illustrated by the zeal of controversialists, or the indefatigable labours of churchmen and their antagonists; but it suffices for our present purpose to indicate the leading principles which are the basis of the constant pretensions of Rome, and the object of the constant opposition of those who have contended either for the liberty of the Church or for the joint claims of temporal sovereignty. From the days of Hildebrand to those of Innocent III., Europe had become familiarised with these claims, which, to use the expression of Dean Milman, 'in their latest significance amounted to an absolute irresponsible autocracy. The essential inherent supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal powers, as of the soul over the body, as of eternity over time, as of Christ over Cæsar, as of God over man, was now an integral part of Christianity. . . . The assertion of these powers by the Church had been, however intermittingly, yet constantly growing, and had now fully grown into determinate acts. The Latin clergy had been busy for many centuries in asserting, under the specious name of their liberty, the supremacy of the Church, which was their own supremacy; for several centuries in asserting the autocracy of the Pope as head of the Church.' This was the fundamental doctrine which lay at the root of the supremacy of Rome, and which may be traced in every page of that confused and heterogeneous mass of precepts, rescripts, and papal decrees which form the body of the Canon Law,—that Canon Law, be it remembered, which forms to this day the basis of the authority claimed by the Romish Church, and the sole limit, if it have any limit, to her jurisdiction. 'Our power,' said Innocent III. in a decretal of 1200, 'rests on no human constitution, but on a divine commission.'*

* 'Constitutiones principum ecclesiasticis constitutionibus non præminent, sed obsequuntur.' (*Decretal*, i. 2. c. 10.) 'Quicumque à

To enforce these claims, the interest of the Church was uniformly held to be paramount to all other obligations, whether of moral duty or political allegiance. 'Juramentum contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam non tenet.' (*Sext. l. xi. c. i.*): and to determine what the interest of the Church was, lay absolutely within the jurisdiction and the power of interpretation exercised by the Popes. 'Pour ceux qui professent ces doctrines,' says M. Dupin in his vigorous and learned treatise on Ecclesiastical Law, 'l'Eglise doit former une sorte d'Etat dans l'Etat, ayant son vrai souverain à l'étranger et ses lois à part. Il prétend ne relever que de lui seul, et ne pouvoir être atteint ni par les lois du pays qu'il brave, ni par les magistrats qu'il insulte et qu'il défie.' Rome alone has the power to interpret and to define what is the extent of her own rights and privileges. They rest not upon the tenor of this Concordat, or of any other agreement between the finite and the infinite, between the temporal and the eternal. A bare recognition of the source of such pretensions by any temporal authority is enough. A bare admission of rights, which are by their nature unlimited, since they are held to rest upon the ordinances of God, includes every other condition and overrules every objection.

Such has been the language of the Church of Rome in all ages, when she has freely dared to express her theory of the relations between the ecclesiastical and the civil power. To use the words of an ecclesiastical writer, 'Vidimus per omnes ferè ætates duellum papalis insolentiæ et ecclesiasticæ libertatis;' and we are thus led to consider whether, on these principles, any equal synallagmatic compact can be said to exist between the State and the Church of Rome. In such transactions, the difference existing between the objects and the very nature of the contracting parties is an essential and incurable difference. The Church asserting a paramount, indefeasible, and unlimited power, resting on its claim to a divine commission and on its own interpretation of that commission, can never be said to relinquish or surrender to the State any portion of the maxims of government which are an indissoluble portion of its constitution. If such a concession were apparently made by one Pope, it would be retracted by another; for as each successive Pontiff professes to enjoy the same boundless authority, he

principibus in ordinibus vel in ecclesiasticis rebus decreta inveniuntur, nullius auctoritatis esse monstrantur.' (*Decret. distinct. 96.*)

'Uterque est in potestate Ecclesiæ spiritualis scilicet gladius et materialis. Oportet autem gladium esse sub gladio, et temporalem auctoritatem spirituali subjici potestati.' (*Extravagant. l. 8. Boniface VIII.*)

is not bound by treaties any more than he would be bound against the interest of the Church by oaths.* Urban VIII. said, not unreasonably, that the authority of one living Pope was worth more than the rescripts or engagements of a hundred dead Popes. From the Concordat of Calixtus (1122.) to that of Pius IX., the pretensions of the Church have always been extended and confirmed rather than circumscribed by such instruments. When a nation has resolved to assert its own independence in ecclesiastical government, and to set bounds to the oppression and extortion of Rome, such measures have been taken by its own rulers and its own lawgivers: such were the measures which, from an early period in English history, opposed a firm barrier to the Canon Law, to foreign patronage, and to the Romish jurisdiction. Such were the measures which established in France the liberties of the Gallican Church, upon the bases of the Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis, and that of Charles VII., which were then called the common law of Christendom. Such, lastly, were the measures which marked in Germany the long struggle of the Papal and the Imperial Powers, and which finally secured to the Church in Austria, under the reigns of Maria Theresa, the Emperor Joseph, and even the Emperor Francis, those rights which the present Emperor has just renounced and annihilated.

No doubt, in all ages, and under all forms of religion, a conflict has existed between the theocratic and the political authorities which divide the empire of society and the mind of man: the one asserting a power superior to human laws, under the awful sanction of a supernatural commission; the other resting upon that which makes human law binding, as the expression of the national will. In countries where the authority of the Romish Pontiff has never existed, or has long ceased to prevail, this struggle has incessantly gone on: it existed under the institutions of Paganism, and it has recently torn no inconsiderable body of devout and disinterested members from the bosom of the Church of Scotland. But a new and very important element is introduced into this contest of the civil and the ecclesiastical powers, when a foreign potentate, acknowledging no laws but those of his own creation and claiming infallibility in the application of them, asserts a right to intervene in these questions, and to subject the ecclesiastical, and, in some degree,

* It was one of the ten *gravamina* of the German nation, presented in 1510 to the Emperor Maximilian: 'Quod ad servandas bullas, pacta, privilegia et literas ab antecessoribus abque omni derogatione concessas, successores Pontifices teneri se non arbitrantur.' (*Ap. Freherus*, tom. ii. p. 372.)

the civil, institutions of a nation to his supreme will.* That is the position claimed by Rome in the commonwealth of States which acknowledge or have ever acknowledged her authority; and it is scarcely necessary to add, that she does intervene in these questions only to render her own advantage paramount to every other consideration. At certain times when the temporal authority of Emperor or King has threatened the dignity or the property of the Church, she has thrown all her might on the side of the Clergy—the kingdom of France, or that of England, has been placed under an interdict—the melancholy toll and the solemn chaunt of the last offices for the dying were heard before the Church closed her doors upon the people—or again an imperial penitent has been reduced to supplicate from the stern forgiveness of the Pontiff a crown which such a prince was unworthy to wear. Nor are these examples confined to mediæval traditions; the same spirit animates to this hour the relations of Rome with the clergy of Piedmont, of Ireland, and to some extent of Spain, where the clergy have become the instruments of Rome and the antagonists of the State.

At other times, when Rome has found in the national clergy a spirit of independence, more common in past ages than in our own, the Popes have not scrupled to ally themselves more closely with the temporal power, so as to silence the claim for the restoration of those rights which the Papacy or the Empire had gradually wrested from the primitive church. These compacts between the State and the See of Rome have usually been termed Concordats; and it is well deserving of remark, especially with reference to the subject now before us, that although these arrangements have ever been made under pretence of an ardent zeal for the welfare of the Church and of religion, they have generally been prejudicial to the independence of the one and to the interests of the other, as indeed might well be anticipated when two parties settle their differences at the expense of a third. Such was the celebrated concordat of Francis I. with Leo X., when the King of France conspired to betray the liberties of the Church in his dominions, the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438 was violated, and the act of the Crown was condemned by several of

* What is the limit between ecclesiastical and civil institutions? It is impossible to define it. In Spain the Holy Office claimed the right of controlling the export of mules and horses, because they might be sold to the infidel; and a Pope once proceeded to excommunicate the seignory of Venice for allowing corn to be sold to the enemies of the Faith. The Venetians replied by their national cry: 'Primi Veneziani, poi Cristiani.'

the parliaments and bishops of France. The policy of Rome has generally been to render the clergy in any given State closely and absolutely dependent on herself and on the great religious Orders which are the direct instruments of her authority; and this has been accomplished in the first instance by a close alliance with the temporal government. But when this end has been obtained, and the clergy are thoroughly imbued with the doctrines of the Ultramontane School, then the Church itself becomes the chief engine of Rome in opposition to the State; the absolute liberty of the Church is made the pretext for the introduction of its own peculiar laws and authority, and both the great elements of society and of government fall successively under the influence of the Papal Power.

Again, at some rare intervals in history, the excesses or the depression of the Papal Power have united the temporal authority and the National Church against its pretensions: that spirit of independence enabled Henry VIII. to effect the separation of this country from Rome, and it was maintained with almost equal vigour in France during a great portion of the reign of Louis XIV.

It would be easy to multiply examples of these conflicting relations which have occurred at various times in every part of Europe. Perhaps indeed the chief error of modern historians has been to suppose that the series of these events had reached its termination, and that the Papacy has ceased, after a protracted resistance to the spirit of the age, to maintain so hopeless a contest. We see no reason to doubt that as long as the power of Rome continues to prevail over a large portion of the Christian world, the same results must perpetually recur. But no country in Europe has witnessed this struggle on a grander scale than Germany; no people has borne a larger part in it than the German nation. Professor Ranke observes with truth, that the whole life and character of Western Christendom consists of the incessant action and counter-action of Church and State; and that in Germany, where more persevering and original thought has been bestowed on ecclesiastical and religious subjects than on any other, the events of ten centuries turn upon the struggles between the Empire and the Papacy, between Catholicism and Protestantism. The more extraordinary and incredible is it that at the close of this long æra of contention for the liberties of the Church, the nation which defied Innocent III. and produced Luther, should now in this our day submit to the whole imposition of Romish power, and that the sovereign who fills the seat of the Cæsars should deliberately abdicate every principle for which his ancestors contended.

As early as the 9th century the project of the Popes might be traced to overthrow the existing constitution of the Church, which in every country still 'essentially rested on the authority of the metropolitan, to place the whole Church in immediate subjection to the Pope of Rome, and to establish a unity of the spiritual power, by means of which it must necessarily emancipate itself from the temporal.* The spurious decretals of Isidore were pressed into the service, and the supreme authority of the Romish Canons was promulgated as an article of faith. But this doctrine met with no servile acceptance from the people of Germany. Those tribes which had scarcely found a common name until they were united under the powerful sceptre of Charlemagne, were roused at once into national existence by the pretensions of the Italian Church; and it is worthy of remembrance that the first act in which the Germans appear as one people is their resistance to the attempt of the clergy to depose their sovereign and to determine by Papal authority the election of the Emperor. The sovereignty of Otho the Great, who may be considered even more than Charlemagne the founder of the true German Empire, rested on the principle of opposition to the encroachment of that authority; and whilst it maintained throughout Europe the beneficent and civilising influences of Christianity, that empire kept at bay in Italy the formidable power which threatened to subdue the independence of the world. In succeeding centuries the eternal contest rolled on with various results—at one time the Church, at another the Imperial Power gained ground. The divisions of the temporal princes and the peculiar constitution of the Germanic body, which has remained from the earliest ages to the present day incapable of completing the fabric of a State, were undoubtedly favourable to the spiritual power; and whilst in England the germs of public liberty and national strength sprang from the first contests of the aristocracy and the clergy against the Papal authority, in Germany, on the contrary, the influence of Rome successfully arrested the complete development of the national power. If Otho the Great had claimed the distribution of the symbols of spiritual authority, which gave rise to the great quarrel of the Investitures, his degenerate successor, the Emperor Henry IV., found himself deposed, and saw his subjects released from their allegiance by the mandate of Gregory, and even the shameful penance of Canossa failed to restore him to security or honour on the imperial throne. Henry V. extorted from Pope Paschal an agree-

ment by which the Emperor acquired the right of investiture ; but in the following year the affair was submitted to a numerous Council in the Lateran, and, with the consent of the Pope, this Council cancelled the treaty. It was reserved for Calixtus II. to conclude at Worms, in the year 1122, the first regular Concordat between the Emperor and the Papal See, which secured to the Popes a large share of patronage and authority. A monkish poet said of this first Concordat what may be said with equal truth of the last,—‘*Reddit Apostolico Cæsar quæcumque rogavit.*’ The triumph of the Papacy which had begun at Canossa, and been sealed at Worms, was fully established at the interview of Frederic Barbarossa and Pope Alexander III. at Venice ; and the temporal power of the Popes attained its highest pinnacle when Innocent III. decided the election of the German Emperor, and the greatest nation of that age in Europe received its head from a foreign priest. With those revolutions of the empire we are not immediately concerned, except in as far as they moulded the laws, traditions, and pretensions of the Church herself. The ambition of Innocent burnt itself out, and there was little danger that the Popes of any succeeding age should repeat his gigantic part in the political affairs of Europe. But the same imperious spirit which disposed that Pope to trample on so many sovereigns and nations, left imperishable traces in the sanctuary itself, and the foundation of the Mendicant Orders supplied Rome with legions of zealous and unscrupulous agents who have since become, in various forms, the direct agents of her power all over the world.

In the latter half of the 13th century the Sicilian court of the Hohenstaufens, under the Emperor Frederic II., became the fairest example witnessed by the Middle Ages, of the luxury and grace which laid the foundation of Italian culture and Italian taste. For the first time in those ages a kingdom and race of sovereigns existed in Southern Europe who seemed destined to be the legislators of a temporal kingdom set apart from the one great religious Empire, whose vast foundations covered so large a portion of Europe, and a school of law was founded at Naples which repudiated the encroachments of the Canonists of Bologna and of Rome.

‘There was,’ says Dean Milman, ‘if not an avowed independence, a threatening disposition to independence. The legislation, if it did not directly clash, as it seemed to do with the higher law of the Church, if it did not make the clergy wholly subordinate, degraded them in some respects to the rank of subjects ; if it did not abrogate, it limited what were called the rights and privileges, but which were, in fact, the separate rule and dominion of the clergy ; at all events it

assumed a supremacy—set itself above, admitted only what it chose of the great Canon Law of the Church; it was self-originating, self-asserting, it had not condescended to consult those in whom for centuries all political as well as spiritual wisdom had been concentrated; it was a legislation neither emanating from, nor consented to by, the Church.' (*Latin Christianity*, vol. iv. p. 369.)

But Gregory IX. was a pontiff eminently qualified to meet that emergency. He was the first canonist of his time, and combined the subtilty of a great lawyer with the pretensions of a churchman. He it was who gave to the body of the Canon Law the form it has since retained. The compilations were framed by the Pope himself aided by Raimond de Pennafort, a noble and learned Spaniard of the Dominican order, who passed for the most able jurist in Bologna.* The body of the Canon Law was framed in imitation of the body of the Civil Law, which then began to attract the studies of the learned. The first part of this work contained the earlier traditions of the Church; the second the decretals of Gregory IX. himself.

'The whole was promulgated as the great statute law of Christendom, superior in its authority to all secular laws as the interests of the soul were to those of the body, as the Church of greater dignity than the State; as the Pope higher than any one temporal sovereign, or all the sovereigns of the world. Though especially the law of the clergy, it was the law binding likewise on the laity as Christians, as religious men, both as demanding their rigid observance of all the rights, immunities, independent jurisdictions of the clergy, and concerning their own conduct as spiritual subjects of the Church. All temporal jurisprudence was bound to frame its decrees with due deference to the superior ecclesiastical jurisprudence; to respect the borders of that inviolable domain, not only not to interfere with those matters over which the Church claimed exclusive cognisance, but to be prepared to enforce by temporal means those decrees which the Church in her tenderness for human life, in her clemency, or in her want of power, was unwilling or unable herself to carry into execution. Beyond that sacred circle, temporal legislation might claim the full allegiance of its temporal subjects; but the Church alone could touch the holy person, punish the delinquencies, control the demeanour of the sacerdotal order; could regulate the power of the superior over the inferior clergy, and choose those who were to be en-

* Such is the account given of Raimond by Dean Milman, but it is disputed by some of the modern canonists. The editor of the Marburg edition of the Gregorian Decretals (1839) says: 'Tam negliger tamque libidinose in lucem emisit Raymundus hanc collationem;' and Contini, in the preface to the Antwerp edition of 1570, says: 'Multo justius de Raymundo isto dici posse quam de Triboniano multas illum utilissimas constitutiones misere laniasse et lacerasse.'

rolled in the order. The Church alone could administer the property of the Church; that property it was altogether beyond the province of the civil power to tax; even as to feudal obligations, the Church would hardly consent to allow any decisions but her own; though compelled to submit to the assent of the Crown in elections to benefices which were temporal fiefs, yet that assent was, on the other hand, counterbalanced by her undoubted power, to consecrate or to refuse consecration. The book of Gregory's Decretals was ordered to be the authorised text in all courts and in all schools of law. It was to be, as it were, more and more deeply impressed into the minds of men. Even in its form it closely resembled the Roman law, yet unabrogated in many parts of Europe; but of course it comprehended alike those who lived under the different national laws which had adopted more or less of the old Latin jurisprudence; it was the more universal statute-book of the more wide-ruling, all-embracing Rome. (*Latin Christianity*, vol. iv. p. 372.)

We borrow this striking description of the Canon Law from the Dean of St. Paul's, because it accurately and forcibly describes that code which originated in the epistles and rescripts of the early popes, collected and annotated by Gratian, perfected by Gregory IX., and at last formed into the Statutes of the Church, under the binding authority of the Council of Trent. What it was in the 12th century it has remained through all the ages of Church history, and it is at the present hour, a law invested with the mystic authority of the viceregents of Christ—not emanating from the will of a people or a sovereign but imposed by the subtle domination of the priesthood,—and a system directed exclusively to the advantage not of its subjects, but of its authors. Such is the Canon Law, which the clergy of Rome have in all ages professed and upheld as their sole rule of government, for in the plenitude of their power they vouchsafed to recognise no inferior jurisprudence; and such is the Code which the Austrian Concordat has applied irrevocably to that empire, with an express exclusion and renunciation of all the laws of the State in opposition to its provisions.

The contest of the 14th century undoubtedly weakened the Papal power. The exile of the Popes to Avignon, and the schism which divided the Papacy itself between two hostile factions, was favourable to the ascendancy of that Ghibelline party which ranked among the champions of the Imperial Power the most illustrious names in Italian literature and the heralds of Italian civilisation. The cause which appeared to have perished with
 on the scaffold,—Conradin whom Boniface VIII. describes in one of his rescripts in the Sext as that prince who came
de venenosâ radice Frederici, quondam Romani Imperatoris, oculubrî tortorisi,—triumphed again under the wiser and

stronger government of the Emperor Charles IV., and the liberties of the Church seemed destined for a time to overpower the pretensions of Rome. The Councils of Pisa, of Constance, and of Basle, which were assembled to put an end to the scandal of two rival Popes, asserted that supremacy of the councils of the Church which the Popes had virtually denied; and the principles successfully established by those assemblies formed the basis of the Pragmatic Sanction ratified at Bourges in 1438 under Charles VII., by the prelates, nobles, and notables of France. A system of canons and decrees was established to control the usurped authority of Rome. The disputes which had raged so furiously throughout the Middle Ages were terminated by a partial recognition of the joint authority of the temporal power in the affairs of the Church, and by a more absolute exclusion of the ecclesiastical power from all direct interference in the affairs of the State. In France, even the Concordat of Francis I. left the essential liberties of the Gallican Church unshaken*; in Germany, the Concordat concluded in 1448 between Pope Nicholas V. and the Emperor Frederic III., continued for upwards of three centuries to regulate the relations of Rome with the spiritual and temporal princes of that country.

The Germanic Concordat was, however, considerably less favourable to the rights of the civil power than the Pragmatic Sanction and the Concordat of France. The Popes Martin V. and Eugenius IV. found means to evade and defeat in Germany those conditions which the Council of Constance and the Council of Basle endeavoured to establish throughout Christendom, and which were fully adopted in France. In order to preserve the exercise of some portion of their national rights, the German Princes consented to sacrifice the greater part of them to the demands of the Roman Chancery. The Pope had the right to appoint to all the dignities and preferments of the Church

* The French Concordat of 1517 was received with indignation by the nation. It was denounced as a *seminarium omnis generis hæreseon simoniarum et fiduciarum; exterminationem scientiæ, virtutis, pietatis, regni denique pestem*. The parliament of Paris refused for two years to register it; and an appeal to the future council was interjected by the Chapter of Notre Dame and the University of Paris. Nevertheless Merlin is of opinion that these violent expressions were undeserved, and that the Concordat was not a mischievous encroachment on the Pragmatic Sanction, though the Chapters lost the right of electing bishops, and the nomination of these prelates was secured to the Crown. The elective power of the Chapters survived in Germany long after it perished in France, and still obtains in many of the abbeys and collegiate churches of Austria.

when they became vacant *in curiâ Romanâ*, and to all the dignities and preferments vacated by other papal nominations. The usage of elections was reestablished in all the metropolitan and cathedral churches, subject to the confirmation of the Pope. All the other benefices were at the disposal of the ordinary. This Concordat remained in force throughout Germany down to the termination of the Empire, but its articles were limited to the subjects which had been principally disputed in the Middle Ages, and many other matters of greater interest had arisen in more recent times, for which this instrument did not provide.

Such were the relations of the Church with the chief States of Europe down to the end of the 15th century; and although none of those States had at that time thrown off its spiritual allegiance to Rome, none of them yielded an unqualified submission to her exactions and demands. The unity of the Church in matters of faith did not exclude differences of the most vehement character on the limits of ecclesiastical government; and the power of the Popes was never more vigorously contested than by some of those princes who acknowledged their dogmatical infallibility. The period immediately preceding the Reformation was an age of elegant and luxurious indifference at the court of Rome; and the ambition of Julius II. and Leo X. was directed rather to the extension and consolidation of their temporal sovereignty than to the assertion of the paramount claims of their religious supremacy; the authority and discipline of the Church were relaxed, and the protest of Luther was directed not so much against the inordinate and absolute power of the Roman Pontiffs over the independent kingdoms of the world as against the corruption and depravity which had been suffered to pollute the sanctuary. The clergy were powerful, but their power consisted in the part they had acquired in temporal affairs, in temporal education, and in temporal government. Other weapons were needed for that fierce encounter which now awaited them.

Nor were these wanting to the Church. The effect of the Reformation was instantly to shake off the effeminacy and indifference which had crept over the Papal Court; and to form a new alliance between the Papacy, the Romish clergy throughout Europe, and the governments of those states which adhered to the Catholic cause. In the presence of so formidable an enemy as that spirit of inquiry and of freedom, which had pervaded Europe with irresistible force and rapidity, the compact of those powers which subsist by the bondage of the human mind became intimate and complete. The spiritual power instigated the temporal power to the work of persecution and war; the tem-

poral power fought under the standard of the Church. The head of the hierarchy, the Pope of Rome, was once more invested with an authority scarcely inferior to that which his predecessors had claimed in the Middle Ages. The most arrogant pretensions of the time of Hildebrand were resuscitated, and all the resources of the Canon Law were again employed. Above all, the great Order of the Jesuits, which had sprung into existence as the champions of the most arbitrary and intolerant pretensions of Rome, brought their matchless organisation and passionate energy to the rescue of the Church and to the subjection of every other element of human society. The Jesuits laid claim to an absolute supremacy of the Church over the State; and in the Church they created a power and a system resting exclusively on the authority of Rome, and opposed to the rights and liberties once enjoyed and often claimed by the episcopate and the provincial clergy. They asserted the paramount authority of the Pontiff alike over Councils and over kings; and that authority was felt to the uttermost parts of the earth, from the time that the members of the Society of Jesus became its chief instruments, advisers, and ministers to dethrone princes and to trample on nations.

Of these opinions Bellarmine was one of the ablest and most uncompromising expositors; after him, Suarez and Mariana in Spain, Allen and Parsons in England, and a host of sacred controversialists propagated the same doctrines by their writings, and by all the penetrating influence of the Catholic Church from the Court to the confessional. From that time to the present, and indeed wherever and whensoever the order of the Jesuits exists, these doctrines are inculcated. Whoever will take the trouble to follow the course which the Jesuits have filled in the history of modern Europe, will find the same invariable principles, the same consistent consequences. They have at times been overwhelmed by the learning and wit of antagonists such as Arnould, Pascal, or Van Espen; they have even been crushed by the jealousy of the civil power under such ministers as Pombal and the Duc de Choiseul. But our own age has witnessed the revival of their audacity and their power. They have spoken with the eloquence of the Count de Maistre and M. de Bonald; they frame Pastoral letters with the daring ingenuity of Cardinal Wiseman; they inspire the detestable bigotry of the writers in the 'Univers'; they predominate in the provincial synods of France; they have found in Pius IX. a Pope at once weak enough and bold enough to be their instrument; and they have succeeded in imposing upon the heir of the Cæsars and the cautious statesmen of Austria a com-

pact which amounts to a surrender of the dearest rights of sovereignty.

No doubt the cause which has most powerfully contributed in our time to this extraordinary revival of the highest Ultramontane doctrines, and even to their acceptance by those who would seem to be most interested in the maintenance of the opposite principles, is a cause not entirely dissimilar to that which led to the strong Catholic reaction of the 17th century. The outbreak of the Reformation in Germany, and the outbreak of the French Revolution, are the two events which have most affected the state of opinion and the existing powers of the world. In both instances these great convulsions in the Church and the Monarchy seemed to threaten the dissolution of society; in both instances the party of authority, as opposed to the party of freedom, sought to reconstruct out of the fragments of the past a barrier against the increasing and inevitable stream of human progress. The last revolutionary eruption of 1848, which was everywhere accompanied with new and portentous signs of hostility to every form of religion and of law, has been followed, as usual, by a reaction far more severe than any which had preceded it, since it has consigned France to her present form of government and Austria to the Concordat. But those who seek a remedy for the evils of the age in the maxims of the Jesuits and the protection of the Church, appear to forget that these doctrines are in reality the most subversive of that civil power which it is our common interest to consolidate and to improve. The doctrine that the Pope has the power to release subjects from their allegiance to princes and to abrogate even the temporal laws of an independent state when he conceives them to be incompatible with the interests of the Church, is a direct and logical consequence of the divine supremacy accorded to him; but, in fact, this supremacy is exercised not so much by exalting the Pontiff as by degrading the Emperor, since the power claimed by Rome can only become operative at the expense of rights inherent in every national government; and it may be questioned whether in presence of the opposing forces of the 19th century, the alliance of the Church affords any practical compensation for the strength alienated by the State.

Such was not the case in the 16th century; for then faith was in vogue on all sides; the divine right of constituted authorities was recognised as a practical truth in politics, and the united efforts of the Romish Church and the Catholic sovereigns, more especially those of the House of Austria, did unquestionably succeed in bringing a very large portion of their dominions once more within the pale of the Church. The Council of Trent was the instrument

which effected this revolution, and identified the policy of the Church of Rome for ever with the reaction against the Reformers of Germany, Switzerland, and England. Other Councils had before given the law to the Church and judged the disputes of contending pontiffs; but at Trent the Church itself received the seal of the absolute Papal authority, and it is on the acts of the Council of Trent that the modern canonists and champions of the Papal government rest their most absolute claims to domination.

We may refer the reader to the chapter in Mr. Robins's volume on the claims of Rome * in which he treats of the acts and constitution of the Council of Trent, for a summary of its proceedings. The Council consisted almost exclusively of Italian prelates, few Spaniards, hardly any Germans; in the latter sessions no French bishops were present. The whole attendance seldom exceeded sixty prelates, and often fell below that number.† The great National Churches were not summoned. The measures of the Council were all prepared by Congregations under the direct influence of Rome; the articles of Reformation prepared by command of the Emperor Ferdinand were not presented at all to the Council. The mode of voting was determined by Rome, and extended to the Generals of the Religious Orders all in her exclusive interest. Such was the bondage in which the Council was held, that the Emperor protested to the Pope, 'nil proponi aut tractari quod à Romanâ curiâ speciatim haud imponatur.' It was held that the bishops were bound by their episcopal oath to defer in all things to the will of the Pope. Yet we are now to be told, in the 19th century, that the laws framed in this manner by a pretended œcumenical council, but in reality by the influence of the Popes alone, are absolutely binding on the Emperor, on the Bishops, and on the whole Church; and the whole tenor of the Austrian Concordat is to recognise these pretensions, and to lend to them the servile support of the temporal power.

Even at the Catholic Courts, in the middle of the 17th century, there arose a spirit of more energetic resistance to the encroachments of Rome. The estates of the Germanic Empire endeavoured, in the election capitulations of 1654 and 1658, to limit the jurisdiction of the nuncios and the Curia by stricter provisions. Sovereigns and States assumed an independent bearing, and emancipated themselves completely from all sub-

* Robins, p. 364.

† The whole number of prelates who attended from first to last was 201, of these 189 were Italians, only 2 Germans, and 1 English.

servience to the Papal policy. Richelieu and Mazarin were churchmen and princes of the Church, but they held that dignity to be altogether subordinate to the glorious allegiance they owed to the Crown of France. Louis XIV. was a persecutor and a bigot, but he held uncompromising language to Innocent XI.; and, whilst he expelled the Protestants and condemned the Jansenists, he ruled the French clergy with as much independence as Henry VIII. The maxims that the temporal power is independent of the spiritual; that a Council is superior to the Pope; and that the usages of the Gallican Church are inviolable, since even in questions of faith the decision of the Pope is subject to amendment so long as it has not received the assent of the Church,—were the principles preached by Bossuët, signed by the Bishops of France in 1682, and sanctioned by the Crown. They are the principles which are maintained by every power capable of self-respect and endued with strength to support its rights. Yet in the later and less fortunate years of his reign, when Louis himself was falling into closer dependence on Madame de Maintenon and the Jesuits, the Grand Monarque receded from the position he had assumed, and though he still maintained that every member of the Church ought to be free to adhere to the four articles, he ceased to require that they should be considered imperative. No doubt the Jansenist controversy contributed to strengthen the ascendancy of the Ultramontane party, for the opinions which had originated in the Augustinian doctrines of Predestination and Grace had led to a course of action on the part of the Jansenist divines vehemently opposed to the arbitrary policy of Rome. Hence a class of canonists arose, amongst whom Van Espen and Hont-heim occupy a prominent place, who combined a profound knowledge of the laws of the Church with doctrines of what may be termed constitutional resistance to the Papal Government.

These opinions had acquired so much weight in the 18th century, that the Pope himself, Benedict XIV., a prelate of great learning and judgment, made large concessions to the spirit of the age. In 1753, by the Concordat with Spain, Rome renounced the patronage of the smaller benefices in that kingdom, with the exception of fifty-two benefices reserved as the reward of superior learning or piety. The Court of Sardinia was propitiated by the Concordats of 1741 and 1750, and the great school of jurisprudence which had been formed at Naples succeeded in limiting the rights of the nuncio and in subjecting the clergy to taxation. This course of policy was pursued to a still greater extent by the succeeding Popes,

Clement XIII. and Ganganelli, who ascended the papal throne under the name of Clement XIV. Of the two parties which divided the Curia, that of the 'zelanti' sought to maintain all the claims of the Papacy; that of the 'regalisti,' to which Ganganelli himself belonged, was disposed, for the first and only time in the history of the Church, to make a compromise, on principle, with the temporal powers. His first act was to prohibit the reading of the bull *In Cœna Domini*; and on the 21st July, 1773, being moved by the representations of all the Catholic Crowns, he abolished and annulled the Society of Jesus, with its functions, houses, and institutions. If ever there was a time at which it seemed possible that the Church of Rome could be reconciled to the freedom of Europe and the advance of civilisation, it was at that moment in her history. But the spirit of the Order of the Jesuits survived. Ganganelli was the first victim of their revenge*, and before another half century had elapsed, the counter-revolution restored them to all their former wealth and power.

This period of the last century is, however, of the greatest importance to our present purpose, because it witnessed the establishment in Austria of an independent system of legislation in ecclesiastical affairs which subsisted without material alteration to the present day; and we shall presently see, from the language of the Emperor Joseph II. himself, in what spirit he conducted these reforms. But even before that Prince assumed the sole government of the Imperial dominions, the Empress Maria Theresa had advanced, with her usual energy and wisdom, in the same course. She abolished the Jesuits and set bounds to the augmentation of property in mortmain; she taxed the monastic orders, she excluded them by law from becoming the witnesses to testamentary bequests, she had abolished the monastic prisons, she refused to grant passports for pilgrims to Rome; but above all, she promulgated the law which is the basis of spiritual independence, that no papal bull could be published in the Austrian domi-

* The history of the fall of the Jesuits has been admirably given by the Count Alexis de St. Priest. The evidence that Clement XIV. was poisoned, is extremely strong. Cardinal Bertis, the French ambassador at Rome, arrived after full inquiry at that conviction. On the 26th of Oct. 1774, he wrote to the king, 'Les circonstances qui ont précédé, accompagné, et suivi la mort du dernier pape excitent également l'horreur et la compassion.' But the narrative of the pope's death compiled by the French Cardinal, has mysteriously disappeared. Pius VI. more than once showed the ambassador that he was perfectly acquainted with the dreadful end of his predecessor.

nions without the *placitum regium*, — the approval of the civil authority, that no papal excommunication was to have force or validity, and that the bull *In Cænâ Domini* was of no effect. In an Imperial dispatch of the 23rd June, 1768, the Empress Queen declared that 'all that is not of divine institution belongs to the supreme legislative and executive power of the Sovereign;' and it became a principle of the Austrian Church, that the body of the Canon Law, being derived from the Papal authority only, could have no force without the consent both of the civil government and of the bishops; and that the laws of each state, and the ecclesiastical customs of each country, ought to be observed in preference to it. These doctrines were bitterly resented at Rome. On the death of that great Empress, the Pope refused to allow a mass to be said for her in St. Peter's, and even forbade his domestic ecclesiastics to wear mourning. Joseph retorted that he cared not whether the Bishop of Rome was rude or courteous; and he immediately proceeded to carry on by law the important reforms his illustrious mother had commenced in the Church.

The first measure of the Imperial Government was the entire suspension, by an order of the 24th March, 1781, of the connexion between the Religious Orders in Austria and their Generals or Superiors abroad. The whole regular clergy of the monarchy was at the same time subjected to the bishops. This law remained in force until the signature of the Concordat, but it had been relaxed and invaded with the connivance of the Government since the introduction of the Ligorians and the restoration of the Jesuits.

On the 26th March of the same year an order was promulgated that all papal briefs and bulls must be submitted to the Government, and could not be published without the *placitum regium*. The same rule was applied to the pastoral letters of the Austrian clergy. The bulls *In Cænâ Domini* and *Unigenitus* were to be abrogated, and the former torn out of the church books. On the 14th April, the papal power of absolutions and dispensations was abolished; and, from the 1st October, it was ordered that the papal letters of confirmation for archbishops and bishops were to be approved by the Government, and that the prelates should, before the papal confirmation, take an oath of special fidelity and obedience to the sovereign and to the law of the land. A few days later the matrimonial jurisdiction of Rome was annulled, and the power of granting dispensations transferred to the bishops; and by the patent of the 16th January, 1783, marriage was declared to be a civil contract, and all its consequences were henceforth to be exclusively regulated by the laws

of the civil power. Mixed marriages had already been expressly sanctioned by law. By the measures for the suppression of monasteries, about 700 religious houses were closed, and it was said that 36,000 monks were set free—but the number is probably exaggerated. The incomes of the parochial clergy were augmented from the suppressed convents. The clergy were to be educated in Austrian seminaries only, and not at Rome; and the Canon Law was only to be taught by lay professors.

These legislative measures were of course denounced with the utmost fury by the Ultramontane party, at the head of which was Count Migazzi, Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna, who, by a gross violation of the laws of the Church in his own person, united the rich bishopric of Waizen in Hungary to the metropolitan see of Austria; yet this prelate became the champion of Rome against the independent interest of the Austrian episcopate. The Emperor treated his objections with extreme contempt. The same cause was taken up by the Elector and Archbishop of Treves, who addressed to the Emperor a vehement remonstrance for the papal authority against the *placitum regium*—against the abolition of the exactions and immunities of the Regular Orders—against the prohibition of sending money to Rome—against the abolition of the bulls *In Cœnâ Domini* and *Unigenitus*, and lastly against the suppression of the ecclesiastical censorship on books. The answer of Joseph was in these words: it was written from his Camp on the 24th October, 1781.

‘How much I am obliged to Your Royal Highness for the interest you take in all I do, and even in the welfare of my soul, of which I think I may be sure, without allowing myself to be lightly disturbed on the subject. Unfortunately, I have nothing with me here but the instructions of the Great Frederic to his generals and the memoirs of Marshal Saxe. My Quesnel, my Busenbaum, and even the orthodox Febronius* are at home in my library. How can I then expect to

* Febronius, whose German name was Hontheim, Coadjutor of the diocese of Treves, had defended the rights of the civil power and the bishops in ecclesiastical affairs, in his treatise ‘*De Statu Ecclesiæ et Legitimâ Potestate Romani Pontificis, Liber singularis ad reuniendos Dissidentes in Religione composuit.*’ This book was published in 1763, at Bouillon, in the Duchy of Lorraine, with the motto, ‘*Justitia et Pax osculata sunt.*’ It was dedicated to the Pope, but it disputed the monarchical absolutism of Rome, and it aimed at terminating the great schism by concessions Rome will never consent to make. The following sentence gives an idea of the argument: ‘*Ego sane potestatem nullam rejicio quæ ad utilitatem Ecclesiæ, ad commodationem templi, hoc est ad compactionem membrorum corporisque Christi conjunctionem, pertinere videatur; illam verò quæ dominatum à Christi instituto alienum, florenti-*

answer fully the important questions which your Royal Highness has been pleased to address to me in five points? I should not have time to attempt it, if a shower of rain did not enable me at this moment to moralise with you, instead of exercising my troops.

'1. As regards the *Placitum Regium*, it appears to me that if the visible head of the Church, as he is called, sends forth an order from the Vatican to the faithful in my dominions, I, as sensible and real head, ought to be informed of it and have some influence in the matter.

'2. As for the abolition of the immunities of certain Religious Orders, it is well known to Your Highness, that a complete sovereign authority is not obliged to submit to defer to any other. I should never forgive myself if I led the Papal Court into error, or confirmed it in error, by asking for something which does not belong to it. That would be to overlook my own rights.

'3. As for the spoliation of benefices in case of violation of the laws, Your Royal Highness has yourself the goodness to remark that I have indirectly that right by the seizure of the temporalities. But as the indirect course is that of the false or the weak, I prefer the direct one, being neither one nor the other.

'4. In relation to the two bulls *In Cænâ Domini* and *Unigenitus*, your Royal Highness, it seems, disapproves the former; but the expression of my ordinance "to tear them out of the rituals," appears to distress you. Allow me to suggest that in your own diocese a paper should be pasted over them with these four words, "*Obedientia melior quam victima*;" words, which if I am not mistaken, Samuel addressed to Saul in relation to certain Amalekites. The bull *Unigenitus* is posterior to any œcumenic council, and is therefore far removed from the infallibility of a decision of the whole Church. It has been accepted by some, and rejected by others, so that it would seem that an order, such as I have given, to say no more about it, is not superfluous. Fortunately my good Austrians know nothing of either Molinos or Arminius; and would ask if they were Roman Consuls. I myself once knew a greyhound called Molinos, who would kill a hare single-handed. So little do we know of the controversies of grace. Nothing more will be said of them here, and it would have been as well to say nothing for the last thirty years.

'I trust we may both go by the nearest road to heaven, if we discharge the duties of the station in which it has pleased Providence to place us, and do honour to the bread we eat. You eat the bread of the Church and protest against all innovations; I eat the bread of the State and defend and restore its primitive rights.'*

'*oribus Ecclesie sæculis incognitum, iis qui foris sunt terribilem quærit, à populi cervicibus removendum contendo.*' It is the fashion nowadays, at Vienna, to stigmatize the liberal policy of the Emperor Joseph as Febronianism, and the Concordat is regarded as a final triumph over the heresies of that school.

* *Briefe Josephs des Zweiten*, p. 86.

The policy of Joseph II. was to establish the independence of the Church in his dominions and its direct relation with the State. The Pope protested against what was considered at Rome a monstrous invasion of the rights of the Church, but Prince Kaunitz was instructed by the Emperor to declare that 'beyond the principles of the faith, he did not admit that the See of Rome could have the smallest power in the State, since that belonged exclusively to the sovereign of the land; and that although His Majesty recognised the authority of Rome in all that concerned the cure of souls, he rejected without exception everything in the Church which was not of divine origin, but of human invention.' The Pope soon afterwards undertook a journey to Vienna to endeavour to bend the resolution of the Emperor. He was received with enthusiasm by the people; and even the pontifical slippers were worshipped by the Austrian nobility. But Joseph held his course, and declared that whilst he lived no power on earth would divert him from it. He completed his work, and though bigotry and oppression have long since regained their ascendancy in the Austrian dominions, the great palladium of the independence of the Imperial Government and of the National Church subsisted under the protection of the Josephine laws for nearly seventy-five years, until it was sacrificed and abandoned, as we shall presently see, by the anti-national and pusillanimous policy of a Government which has once more placed itself in relation to Rome, in a position more abject than that which was occupied at any former period.

The exact state of the ecclesiastical law in Austria during this period, and the relations of that empire with the Papal See, are accurately described in a work entitled '*Enchiridion Juris Ecclesiastici Austriaci*,' compiled by no less a personage than George Rechberg, the Episcopal Chancellor of the Diocese of Linz. This manual obtained so high a reputation that it was adopted as a text-book, not only in the universities of Germany, but also in those of Italy in the states subject to the Austrian dominion. It was translated into Italian and printed at Venice by authority in 1819 for the guidance of the Italian clergy, and the civil servants of the Empire. In 1827, when the contest for Catholic Emancipation was at its height in this country, Count Ferdinand Dalpozzo, then a Piedmontese exile in England, published an epitome of this curious work, under the title of '*Catholicism in Austria*,' for the purpose of showing what the system of ecclesiastical law was which had been formed under the reigns of Maria Theresa, Joseph II., and Leopold II., with the assistance of the most eminent German and Italian civilians

of the Empire. At that time this system was considered a masterpiece of legislation and a sufficient bulwark of the civil power against the aggressions of the hierarchy. Recent events have proved that even these precautions have been overcome, and that Rome has successively undermined and demolished the barrier raised against her absolute supremacy.

To avoid repetition we shall reserve our examination of the principles of this remarkable Code, until we are enabled to contrast them with the articles of the Concordat by which these provisions have been abrogated. But before we enter on this discussion, we have a few remarks to make on the form of the Concordat itself.*

Although this compact is termed a Convention, it is in fact a one-sided engagement, binding the civil government of Austria to a series of most important concessions to the Church, which are made without reciprocity and without consideration. In fact, it might be inferred from the tenor of such an engagement that the civil power was not represented in it at all; and such is, in point of form as well as in fact, the case. The imperial plenipotentiary who was empowered to negotiate and sign the document, was not the Minister of Foreign Affairs, nor even the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs. No layman was, it seems, to touch the consecrated bond. The Austrian plenipotentiary was no other than the *Archbishop of Vienna*, now Cardinal Archbishop von Rauscher, who was himself the principal author of the scheme; so that by an incredible absurdity, the very first step of the court of Vienna was to place its full powers in the hands of a priest, a Prince of the Church, owing a more than divided allegiance, bound by his own oath of obedience to his spiritual far more than to his temporal sovereign, and alike unable and unwilling to defend any portion of the rights of the civil power. To name such a negotiator was as direct a surrender of the whole question as if Queen Victoria had appointed the Russian Consul General in London to represent the interests of Great Britain at the Conferences of Paris. The whole instrument bears the stamp of its origin. The hand of the State nowhere appears in its articles. It is a capitulation drawn up by the Church and imposed upon a subject and unresisting antagonist. Even the slight recognition introduced here and there of some of the most indisputable rights of the State is

* The Latin term for this instrument is *Conventio*, but in the language of modern Europe the word Concordat has been employed, for six centuries, to describe treaties between the temporal and spiritual power: it is derived from the expression *Concordata* applied to the articles of agreement.

represented as a concession which the Pope has, out of his extreme benevolence, vouchsafed to make to the Emperor. The very language in which the temporal power is named, is that of a contemptuous toleration: and it must be borne in mind that the force of law is given to the Concordat in all particulars with an express and absolute supremacy over all other civil laws, ordinances, and arrangements. The maxim of Maria Theresa is inverted, and the sovereign power is abrogated except in as far as it may exist in subjection to the law of the Church, interpreted by churchmen. We have before us the text of the Concordat itself in Latin and German, and lest we should be led into any misapprehensions of its provisions, we are also in possession of a most remarkable exposition and defence of the whole measure, published by authority at Vienna, entitled '*Studien über das Concordat*.' To this singular production we shall presently have occasion to refer. It is obviously the work of a churchman rather than a statesman, or of a canonist rather than a lay jurist, and of course its whole argument rests on the theory of an absolute and irrefragable spiritual power. But we question whether there is any composition extant—certainly we know of no composition published within the last century—in which the claims of the Church are asserted with such incredible audacity. If the principles of these writers are admitted, the Church of Rome is and ought to be, by her divine commission, charged with the supreme government of the human race; and if any evidence be needed to show to what a pitch of extravagance the Ultramontane doctrines are carried by this Concordat, that evidence will be found in this ingenuous confession of its motives and its objects. With this assistance we shall proceed to examine the leading heads of the instrument itself.

I. The fundamental principle of the whole measure is the absolute supremacy of Rome in ecclesiastical government.

'If the Pope,' says the apologist of the Concordat, 'by divine right possesses the primacy of jurisdiction in the whole Church, as far as it extends,—that is, as the *highest legislative, judicial, and penal power* in church affairs belongs to him,—he cannot be any more described as a foreign power or authority in aught that concerns ecclesiastical jurisdiction. This principle of the Primacy of the jurisdiction of the Roman Pope, which lay of old in the precepts of the Catholic faith, and was recognised of old in Catholic States, has now for the first time since the dominion of Febronianism, been freely and openly proclaimed by Austria in the concordata of the nineteenth century.* As Austria

* This assertion is not quite correct. The Duke of Modena had set the Court of Austria an example which it has very faithfully adhered to.

preceded other states in the introduction of the Febronian system, it is the highest merit of the government of the Emperor Francis Joseph that it is the first to reestablish the Catholic basis of Church law.' (*Studien, &c.*, p. 62.)

The Roman Catholic religion is to be maintained* in Austria with all the rights and privileges it claims under the law of God and of the Church; the See of Rome is to have absolute liberty of communicating with the bishops, clergy, and people, without reference to the ruler of the country; and the prelates are free to do everything appertaining to the government of their sees, in accordance with the Canon Law and the approval of the Holy See. To remove all doubt, if any could exist, as to the purport of these articles, we have the positive declaration of Pius IX. himself that —

'As the Roman Pontiff, Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, and successor of the blessed prince of the Apostles, has of divine right a priority of honour and jurisdiction throughout the entire Church, this Catholic dogma has been expressed in most precise terms in the act itself, and the plenipotentiaries have discarded from it, radically eliminated and banished the opinion — false, perverse, fatal, and entirely contrary to the Divine priority of rights, an opinion always condemned and proscribed by the Apostolic See, according to which the *placeat* or *exequatur* of the civil government should be obtained for what concerns spiritual things and ecclesiastical affairs.' (*Papal Allocution of 3rd Nov. 1855.*)

The whole history of modern Europe, and the spirit which has never ceased to animate every sovereign, conscious of his rights and of his duties, even in the most Catholic ages, as we have already shown at some length, conclusively demonstrate that this opinion which the Pope stigmatized as 'false, perverse, fatal and contrary to the divine law,' is a principle which has been uniformly held by the States of Europe — which is a part of the fundamental law of France from St. Louis to Buonaparte — which has been promulgated for centuries in Austria and Spain — which has been recognised by the Popes themselves in many of their Concordats with foreign states — and which has been

* By a signal absurdity the apologist attempts to justify this expression 'conservabitur' by a reference to the declaration signed by the Queen of England on her accession for the maintenance of the Established Church of Scotland, under the Act of Parliament in that behalf; not perceiving that the Queen of England binds herself to execute the law of the land as regards the Church of Scotland, whilst the Emperor of Austria binds himself to a series of engagements superior to the law of the land and dependent on another power as regards the Church of Rome.

established by Councils and by Empires as an inalienable right of temporal sovereignty. Even to those who admit a priority of dignity in the Bishop of Rome, the priority of jurisdiction is not less a usurpation; the Pope is 'Primus inter pares,' but not absolute over the Bishops of the Christian Church.

It is laid down by Reehberg as an established maxim of the law of Austria, that every ecclesiastical or papal decree be exhibited to the civil authority before publication, and that publication may be forbidden; that the royal *placet* is required to all papal bulls or rescripts, whether modern or ancient; and in addition, the laws of Hungary declare null all the papal constitutions and letters not confirmed by the Crown. Indeed, such was the law of almost all Christendom. 'Non mirum,' wrote Van Espen, 'proinde quod et passim omnes Principes Catholicos tametsi etiam nexu feudali Sedi Apostolicæ obnoxii, utantur hoc jure tanquam ex ipso jure regalæ et coronæ præstanti.' The Emperor Rodolph II., in 1586, prohibited the Apostolic Legate from promulgating the bull *In Cena Domini* in Bohemia, and the same Emperor declared generally that no papal mandates should be published without the previous assent of the Crown. Even for the legal publication of the decrees of the Council of Trent, it was held by the House of Austria as well as by the King of France, that promulgation by the Pope was insufficient and of no effect, and these orders were proclaimed by Philip II. in his dominions in 1565, by his own authority and without any reference to the Pope at all. In the year 1574 * the same Prince, then the great champion of the Catholic cause in Europe, and in the midst of the sanguinary contest for the establishment of the Inquisition in the Netherlands, promulgated his Pragmatic Sanction, by which it was decreed that —

'Desiring to maintain and regulate the affairs of the Church in conformity with the ancient constitutions, canons, and the councils of the holy Church to the honour of God and the salvation of souls, We, the King, do order that no bulls, provisions, or other "expeditiones aut im-petraciones Romane," or of the Papal Legates or Apostolic Nuntio, shall or can be admitted into these provinces without the sanction of letters patent to be issued by our privy council for Flanders.'

* A similar edict had been promulgated by the Emperor Charles V. in 1543, and indeed the substance of this edict was no more than the common law of Spain. A letter still exists addressed in 1508, by Ferdinand the Catholic to the Viceroy of Naples, expressing his sovereign displeasure that this officer had not sent to the gallows a man who had introduced papal mandates into the king's dominions "aparte regni more."

Such was the law of Austrian Flanders under either branch of that house, for neither the successors of Philip nor the successors of Maximilian ever before bowed to the degradation of a blind submission to the papal mandates. Another example and we have done. In the year 1718 Dr. Van Espen, Professor of Canon Law in the University of Louvain, and the author of the greatest modern digest of the Canon Law, asserted in his works, that the bulls and rescripts of the ~~See of Rome~~ did not acquire force of law in Austrian Flanders without the knowledge and assent of the Crown, or of the Council of Government. A persecution sprang up, and proceedings were instituted against the Professor, by one Govaerts, then Vicar General of the province, before the Parliament of Malines. Van Espen, blind, afflicted, but not dismayed, prepared to defend himself with an enormous array of canonical learning, but he also appealed to the Court of Vienna for protection. The Emperor Charles VI. caused the doctrines to be examined by a commission, and upon their report the law officers of the Crown were ordered to defend Van Espen for the maintenance of the rights and prerogatives of His Imperial Majesty, 'le ser-vice royal exigeant qu'en ce point le dit docteur soit protégé.' The decision was in favour of the rights of the Crown, but Van Espen himself was obliged to fly to Holland from the malice of his clerical enemies, and he died in exile.

Such were the principles of the House of Austria in opposition to the pretensions of Rome even under Philip II. — even under Charles VI. Such were, in fact, the august and immemorial traditions of the Empire. What are they now? It is evident that the concession which has been made is not only a practical abdication of a notable portion of the sovereign power, but that it is a transfer of that power to a foreign jurisdiction, regulated by foreign laws, and animated by a spirit foreign to the civil power, and frequently opposed to it. It is an engagement on the part of the Emperor to obey rather than to rule; and there is something frightful in the solemn promise to place beyond the knowledge and control of the State and of the law, so many of the dearest interests of society, especially when it is remembered that they are handed over to a class of men who are the eternal enemies of toleration, independence, and liberty of conscience. So essential have these rights been considered to the safety of the state, that when King John II. of Portugal renounced them in 1486 on the demand of Pope Innocent VIII., and entered into some such Concordat as that now before us, the counsellors of the Crown and the jurists of the realm interposed, says the chronicler of that age, '*negantes licere*

‘Regi sine ordinum consensu abdicari se eo jure quod ad communem populi utilitatem tranquillitatemque pertinent.’ And Diego Covarruvias, whom all the writers on the side of the civil prerogatives of the Crown have followed, exclaims, ‘Si quis contendit à Principibus Christianis hanc tollere potestatem, statim comperiet experimento manifestissimo, quantum calamitatis Reipublicæ invexerit.’

It is argued by the subtle apologist who has undertaken the defence of the Concordat at Vienna, that the Imperial *placet* has already been practically abandoned for the last five years; that Bavaria and Naples had already waived it, though Austria is the first Power formally to inaugurate the principle of Papal supremacy in the Concordats of the 19th century; and we are asked what, after all, is the value of this check upon the authority of a Church which is identified with all that is most dear to the State and to society? Our answer shall be categorical. The true value of the royal veto (for such it is) on the acts of the Papal and Episcopal authority, and that which makes this right the cardinal point of the entire question, is not only that it enables the State to regulate the powers of the Church, but, above all, *to define them*. When the two powers are in presence of one another, as they must be in every community professing a religious faith, either the State must define the powers of the Church, and assign to her the limit within which they are to be exercised, or the Church will define and limit the powers of the State by asserting that ‘divine priority’ which the Pope and the defenders of this Concordat assert to be inherent in the Church of Rome. An equal alliance—a perfect balance of authority between the two powers—is not to be hoped for or desired. The idea of sovereignty, the idea of supremacy, is too absolute to admit of partition. Where there is dominion on one side, there is subjection on the other, though it may be subjection protected by law. But where the Church is avowedly paramount and regulated by no laws but her own traditions, the consequence is irresistible, and the real sovereignty of the State is annihilated. To remove all doubt on the subject, it is provided by the first article of the Concordat that the Catholic religion is to be maintained in Austria ‘cum iis juribus et prerogativis, quibus frui debet ex Dei ordinatione et canonicis sanctionibus;’—and by the thirty-fifth article, that ‘all the laws, ordinances, and arrangements which have hitherto been in force in the empire, and in the separate dominions of Austria, shall be held to be abrogated in so far as they are at variance with this Convention; and the same shall henceforth have in the said dominions the force of a law of the land for ever.’

There may be limits to the power of the priesthood in the constitution of modern society and in the temper of the Austrian Government, but there are none within the four corners of this instrument. It reminds us of the instructions given by M. Lédru. Rollin to the revolutionary agents of the republic of 1848, when he sent them forth with the simple mandate, 'Vos pouvoirs sont illimités.' An attempt is made by the apologists of the Concordat, to show that its provisions relate exclusively to the Catholics of the Empire, and do not affect the non-Catholic religious persuasions; but the recent persecutions of the Madini in Tuscany, and of Borcynaki in Austria, have proved how little reliance is to be placed on the tolerance of priests since the abolition of the laws which once restrained their powers.

II. We must pass rapidly over the application of this astounding theory of ecclesiastical power to many of the fundamental institutions of the Empire; and confine ourselves to one or two of the most striking points. Comment is needless on the articles which consign the whole course of instruction, in public and private schools intended for Catholics, to the direct control of the bishops, and render the whole system of education strictly ecclesiastical. On this part of the subject we cannot explain the pretensions of the Church in language more comprehensive than that used by the German prelates assembled at Würzburg in 1848, and adopted by the apologists of the Austrian Concordat.

'Amongst the rights of the Church the divine right of instruction and education comes from above. That right can never be severed from the charge "to teach all nations," nor can it be severed from the consciousness of liberty in the fulfilment of this mission. All ages and all parts of the globe attest that the bearers and instruments of this great commission have not shunned either labour, or danger, or suffering, or death, in the free exercise of the charge confided to them. The proof of the divine right of the Church to educate the human race, is demonstrated by the fact that *she embraces the totality of the mind of man with all-its strength, its activity*, and shapes it to the eternal objects of humanity. The necessary consequences of this essential right is that the Church is to enjoy all that is required for the discharge of it,—the free selection of the persons, corporations, and books employed in education, and a full power of supervision, correction, and removal over them.' *

The expression that the Church of Rome 'embraces the totality of the mind of man,' is at least an unfortunate one. It embraces the State as the tendrils of the parasitic plant embrace and choke

* Denkschrift der in Würzburg versammelten Bischöfe Deutschlands. 1848.

the tree; it embraces the active faculties of the mind as the Python embraces and crushes whatever is clasped in its gigantic folds.

III. To carry a step further this divine right of the Catholic Church 'to embrace the totality of the human mind,' the Concordat recognises the authority of the Church in the censorship of books, and the Emperor binds himself not to suffer that the faith or institutions of the Church shall be slighted either in words or writing. Two great Congregations exist in the Roman Curia for the vigilant discharge of these duties — the first is the Congregation of the Holy Office or of the Inquisition 'contra hæreticam pravitatem;' the second is the Congregation of the Index, especially charged with the censorship and prohibition of books. We find in the Concordat no bar to the intervention of the first of these bodies, and though the formidable name of the Inquisition is kept out of sight, it can hardly be contended that the Church has ever renounced the duty and the right of extirpating heresy by all the means in its power. On this point, however, we only remark that there is no reservation of any existing rights of the non-Catholic sects, nor any distinct provision that the rules of the Church invested with the authority of law of the Empire, are exclusively to be applied to the Catholic subjects of the Crown. In Hungary and Transylvania, where the members of the Greek Church and the Protestant sects are numerous, this circumstance may lead to the most serious consequences; it is a further infraction of the fundamental laws of Hungary, and of the conditions on which that crown was transferred to the House of Austria.*

But on the censorship of books the authority of the Concordat is explicit.

' Archiepiscopi, Episcopi, omnesque locorum ordinarii *propriam auctoritatem* omni modo libertate exercebunt, ut libros religioni morumque honestati perniciosos *censurâ pertringant* et fideles ab eorumdem lectione avertant. Sed et Gubernium, ne ejusmodi libri in Imperio divulgentur, quovis opportuno remedio cavebit.' (*Art. ix.*)

Indeed, we are surprised that any doubt can have been raised on this point. The authority of the Church over books was defined with precision in the rules of the Council of Trent based

* There are in Hungary about 7 millions of Roman Catholics, and 1 million of United Greeks; but 4,300,000 members of the Eastern Church, 850,000 Lutherans, and 1,800,000 Calvinists. In Transylvania there are 200,000 Catholics, 57,000 United Greeks; but 686,000 Eastern Greeks, 215,000 Lutherans, and 350,000 Calvinists and Unitarians.

on a brief of Pope Leo X., and confirmed by a bull of Pius IV. It is provided, by these rules, that the works of heretics are condemned and prohibited; that 'as it is found by experience 'that if the Holy Scriptures are every where permitted in the 'vulgar tongue, more detriment than utility arises,' the use of the Scriptures is to be regulated by the 'ordinary*'; that books of controversy, books of lewdness, books of astrology, and certain books of reference, such as dictionaries and concordances, be prohibited; that in Rome, and in all other places, the manuscript of works for the press shall be submitted to the Bishop or to the Inquisitor of that state or diocese for his sanction and imprimatur; that the shops of printers and booksellers are frequently to be visited by persons deputed by the Bishop or Inquisitor, and that they shall have the power of seizing prohibited books, or of inflicting other punishments 'arbitrio episcoporum 'aut inquisitorum' on the buyers, as well as sellers, of such works. Indeed, it is equally penal to lend a prohibited book or to retain it as executor or heir, under penalty of excommunication and mortal sin.† Such is the strict and indisputable law of the Church to which this Concordat gives a paramount authority, and by which the apologists of the Concordat tell us that the Church performs her sacred duty of embracing the totality of the human mind. In France the authority and jurisdiction of the Roman Congregations have never been admitted; for, said Omer Talon, Advocate General of the Crown in 1647, 'to admit 'their decrees in this realm would be to admit the authority of 'the Inquisition, since the Congregation takes the title of the 'Generalis et universalis INQUISITIO in universâ Republicâ Christianâ adversus hæreticam pravitatem.' But in Austria no restraint is placed on this jurisdiction, and the State binds itself to assist in the execution of its decrees.

The extent and effect of this authority of the Congregation may be understood from the list of their prohibitions. That list contains the names—dear to letters, dear to freedom, dear to civi-

* The apologist of the Concordat denies the prohibition to read the Bible with considerable warmth, and a declaration is quoted of Benedict XIV. (1757), 'ut permissa porro habeatur lectio vulgarium 'versionum quæ ab Apostolicâ Sede approbatæ sunt.' The translations circulated by the Bible Societies were formally condemned by Gregory XVI. in 1844, on the express ground that 'they might lead to 'the exercise of the free judgment on the sense of Holy Writ, or 'might bring into contempt the traditions of the Church based on the 'writings of the Fathers, and even to the rejection of the educational mission of the Church.' (*Studien*, &c., p. 92.)

† *Canones et Decreti St. Conc. Trident. ed. Lipsiæ, 1839, p. 116.*

lisation,—of Machiavel, Descartes, Erasmus, Montaigne, the two Stephens, Scapula, De Thou, Guicciardini, Robertson, Arnauld, Pascal, and the great Jansenists; Grotius, Puffendorf, Van Espen, and Filangieri among the lawyers; Fleury himself among churchmen; Hallam, Giannone, Tamburini, Alfieri's own Life, Combe's Phrenology, Destruitt de Tracy, Cabanis, and Constant. Muratori was saved by Benedict XIV., his personal friend, from being forbidden. This list has been perpetually and copiously extended, and we feel not the slightest surprise that the first use made by the Bishop of Bergamo, of the power given him by the 9th article of the Concordat, was to place under the ban of the Church the works of Schiller! On the 23rd December last, the Archbishop of Milan addressed a circular letter to all the printers and booksellers in his diocese, exhorting them to obey these rules of the Church, not to transgress the 'sacred rules of the Index;' and above all warning them that by virtue of the Concordat, the clergy would, in the event of disobedience to these injunctions, call upon the Government to suspend the guilty persons from the exercise of their trade. The introduction of the Index is an entire novelty in Austria, for it was excluded by the Imperial Constitution of 14th May, 1781. It was also an established maxim of Austrian law, before the present Concordat, that the decisions of the Congregations have no authority out of the Roman States, except in as far as they were received and promulgated by the Government.

IV. The next great article in the Concordat is the revival of the ecclesiastical jurisdictions, with all their incidents and consequences, which had been abolished in the Austrian dominions for the greater part of a century. This principle is expressly laid down in the 10th article.

'Quum causæ ecclesiasticæ omnes, et in specie quæ fidem, sacramenta, sacras functiones, nec non officia et jura, ministerio sacro annexa respiciunt, *ad Ecclesiæ forum unice pertineant*, easdem cognoscet judex ecclesiasticus,' &c.

Under this proposition are included not only all questions of doctrine and discipline, reserved to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but likewise all questions arising out of marriage as one of the sacraments of the Church (with the exception of the civil effects of marriage, which are reserved to the civil courts); and further questions affecting the property and patronage of the Church and the correction of clerks. The management of Church property is entirely withdrawn from the civil government. 'Bonorum ecclesiasticorum administratio apud eos erit, *ad quos secundum Canones spectat.*' The Crown resigns to the Church the fruits of vacant benefices in Hungary as well as in

Austria, and binds itself to contribute as far as possible further property to the Church; 'immo si temporum ratio permittat, et *'ampliora subministraturus est subsidia.'* The endowments of the Austrian Church are so large, that in this respect it has little to ask of the State. At the meeting of the Bishops at Rho, after the signature of the Concordat they proceeded at once to name the treasurer of the Italian dioceses. The Church obtains (Art. xxix.) an absolute right of acquiring new possessions, and of retaining inviolably and for ever her existing and future property, which is placed under the direct authority of the Holy See in pursuance of the decrees of the Council of Trent; so that the supreme rights of property over the national ecclesiastical endowments in Austria are transferred by treaty and by law to Rome, in defiance of the laws of mortmain of Maria Theresa, and of the maxim of Austrian law that the sovereign retains over Church property the same rights which he has over all kinds of property subject to his sway.

No instance can be produced of such a surrender to the Church of the civil rights of society which ought to be especially protected by the sovereign and by the law. Throughout the Middle Ages the great judicial bodies of Europe, the magistracy of France, the law schools of Italy, the Diets and Courts of Germany, the Court of King's Bench of England, afforded the earliest and the firmest barriers against the aggressions of Rome on the judicial power. That power defended itself with success, for it was based on principles of justice not less pure and eternal than those invoked by the Church herself. For six centuries the course of justice has tended to separate itself from the assumptions of ecclesiastical authority, and in modern times that separation might well be considered complete in every civilised state. The episcopal courts have everywhere lost their control over the rights of persons and property, or they have passed, as in this country, into the hands of lawyers, regulated by statutes; and above all, the appeal to Rome, which Henry VIII. flung off by the first stroke of the Reformation, has been circumscribed or extinguished in most Catholic States. It is evident that these ecclesiastical jurisdictions combined every defect which could outrage and oppress society. They administered a system of law alien to the law of the land, unconnected with national institutions, and incapable of reform or improvement since it claimed the immutability of a divine origin. They administered this law by churchmen rather than by lawyers,—that is to say, not by a class of men disciplined to adjust and protect the rights of others, but by a class of men accustomed to identify the exclu-

sive interests of their own order with the source of all justice and the Majesty of Heaven. Lastly, the supreme tribunal which crowned this edifice of legal oppression, was the Roman Curia, where alone the subtlety of these sacerdotal casuists is preserved in a labyrinth of precedents, and where in all ages the right of appeal to Rome has been converted into a means of extortion from the whole Church. The Emperor Maximilian said that the Popes drew a hundred times as much gold from Germany as the Emperors. Such is the jurisdiction which the Court of Austria has now restored, and not only restored but made paramount over all other jurisdictions and laws, whenever the Church shall claim or assert its rights. To render this retrogressive measure more completely ridiculous, it is admitted by the apologist of the Concordat, that the Episcopal Courts have ceased for so long a period to administer the law of the Church in Austria that even the traditions of the art are forgotten.

The direct application of this important change is at once brought home to the laity, by the transfer, to the courts spiritual, of most of the questions affecting the state of marriage. Those questions involve the most delicate and momentous interests of human society, for they touch the affections, the passions, the privacy of domestic life, and the legitimacy of issue. The Church of Rome has exhausted all her ingenuity in accumulating in her matrimonial law a thousand impediments to the natural and legitimate union of the sexes, and these impediments again give birth to a thousand artifices of casuistry by dispensations, by reservations, and all the subtleties of a priesthood which exercises its powers in the extraordinary authority of the confessional. The subjects of the Crown of Austria were formally relieved from these vexatious spiritual obligations by the patent of the Emperor Joseph II. of the 16th January, 1783, declaring 'that all legal determinations respecting the contract of marriage solely depend on the civil authority; and that all questions upon the validity of this contract, and on its consequences, should be solved by the civil courts alone.' (*Dalpozzo*, p. 123.) Dispensations were granted by the bishops, with the assent of the Government, and not by the Pope. The restoration of the full ecclesiastical jurisdiction over these questions is, we sincerely believe, an unexampled aggression on the social freedom of a nation. It is expressly provided that it will include the whole doctrine of *Sponsalia*, or the Romish law of betrothal, and of all impediments to matrimony as determined by the Council of Trent, and the Bull entitled *Auctorem fidei*. The Church, we are

told, places among her other duties that of preventing unhappy marriages !

The ancient claims of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction were based on the immunity of the clergy from legal process, both in civil and criminal matters. '*Sacerdotes a regibus non sunt judicandi sed honorandi*,' was an old maxim of the Canon Law ; and on no point was the contest between the temporal and the spiritual power carried on with more energy. It was the limitation of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by the Constitutions of Clarendon, which led to the disputes between Becket and the king of England ; it was the resistance of the seignory of Venice to the claims of the Church for the immunity of the clergy which led to the contest between that republic and Pope Paul V. in 1606.

For many years almost all traces of this monstrous claim had disappeared from the laws of Europe, nor is the right restored even in the present Concordat ; but as Rome never abandons anything she has once claimed, the Pope affects to consent, '*temporum ratione*,' that the civil suits of the clergy in matters of debt contracts and succession shall be left to secular judges ; and that priests shall not be withdrawn from the criminal judicature of the Empire, save that ecclesiastics are to be punished in ecclesiastical prisons. These last pregnant words revive that awful penal power of the Church, which the Empress Maria Theresa had expressly abolished. This species of concession illustrates the use made by the Papal negotiators even of those claims they cannot hope to retain ; for the act of concession implies, that but for such assent the right would have remained in the Church, and that such assent might have been withheld.

V. In this rapid survey of the fundamental provisions of the Concordat, the position to which it restores the Regular Orders of the clergy remains to be noticed. Whilst the episcopal order in the Church may, to a certain extent, be regarded as the natural champion of the national clergy and of ecclesiastical freedom, and must sometimes find itself opposed to the pretensions of the Papal discipline, the Regular Orders are the moveable divisions of the militant Church ; they are by their constitution wholly denationalised, and they acknowledge no authority save that of their own Superior, living at Rome, in close connexion with the Papal Curia. It is a maxim of the Buddhist fathers of Thibet that the yellow goat browses on any pasture, and that the Lama has no home but his temple. This same peculiarity has invested the Orders of Rome with extraordinary strength and vitality, and has rendered them the most formidable adversaries of liberty of conscience and of all the rights of the

National Churches — nay, formidable even to the Popes whom they pretend to serve. The intolerable influence possessed by the Jesuits in the last century, and the superiority to which they laid claims over the laws and policy of every Catholic State in Europe, were the main causes of the suppression of the Order: but the importance attached by the Popes to the services of that energetic militia, led to their restoration soon after Pius VII. had been brought back to the Vatican, with the assent of the three schismatic sovereigns of Russia, Prussia, and Great Britain.

In Austria the regular Orders have for the last twenty years been regaining the ground they had lost under Maria Theresa, Joseph II., and even under Francis. The laws of 1781 and of 1802, which cut off the connexion of the religious Orders in Austria with their Generals abroad, still subsisted, but they were evaded with the connivance of the government. The Jesuits, and the more modern sectaries of Liguori, once more formed a party in the Church and in the State. At Court they exercised an undisputed influence over the consort of the feeble Ferdinand, and the ambitious mother of the present Emperor. The ascendancy they have acquired is best proved by this Concordat, which bears in every line the stamp of their workmanship; and it may be said that the recognition of their own entire independence was scarcely needed to complete so manifest a triumph over the principles which have hitherto been arrayed against them. Well might the Count de Maistre exclaim*, that the time was come for undertaking in an occult manner the restoration of that magnificent edifice (as he terms the colossal hierarchy of Rome), which had been put down with so much uproar; and it is due to the memory of that prophetic writer to acknowledge, that his conception of the Papal power has at last been realised in the Austrian Concordat.

We have endeavoured to show, though with far less minuteness than the subject would admit of, that the principles and provisions of this Concordat are diametrically opposed to the historical traditions, maintained from the earliest age of modern history by the Empire and by the Catholic Sovereigns of Europe; but this instrument is not less opposed to the fundamental laws of every sovereign and independent nation, and to the doctrines uniformly asserted by civil jurisprudence and by judicial or parliamentary authority. The Supreme Court of justice of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom is said to have de-

* Du Pape, liv. i. cap. 9.

clared to the Government that the Concordat would overrule no less than 2735 laws, decrees, and judgments of the civil power. The number of such contradictions must, in fact, be indefinite, since the paramount authority of the Ecclesiastical Code is solemnly established in all cases in which it shall conflict with the legislation of the Empire. The Concordat is at once a treaty having the authority of an organic law, and a law having the perpetuity of a treaty; or, in other words, a law which cannot be repealed or abrogated without the assent of a foreign Power. The imperial ratification is binding in the most solemn form on the Emperor of Austria and his successors for ever, and no provision is made for any revision or modification of this indissoluble compact. Treaties of this nature between the temporal and spiritual power may be compared to the marble grasp of the statue on the arm of Don Juan; they are, if we may use the expression, treaties in mortmain; and though they have not on the side of the Church the sanction of physical force, their obligations are the more rigorous because they bind the Catholic states by the awful penalties and the unrelenting policy of a Church which claims an unlimited power over the soul. In this position there is no intermediate stage between entire subjection and absolute freedom; and to be relieved from the fetters which the Papal Power has thus laid on the Empire of Austria no path remains open but to reject that power altogether. No doubt such a Convention may easily be evaded or broken by superior force; but the same spirit and the same agency which framed the compact is at hand to enforce it.

It now remains to be briefly considered whether these extraordinary concessions, which are not to be justified on any ground of history or of law, can be explained by considerations of political expediency. On this ground we have sought in vain for any tangible argument on behalf of the Concordat. Its authors and defenders appear to be so exclusively imbued with the spirit of Churchmen, and so satisfied with the absolute character of the ecclesiastical power, that they have nowhere condescended to discuss its political effects on the internal condition, and on the external relations, of the Austrian Empire. Yet we can hardly suppose that a sagacious statesman like Count Buol, who countersigned the imperial ratification of the Convention, has altogether lost sight of those political considerations which affect his own department; nor can Count Leo Thun, whose fervent devotion to the Church renders him more obnoxious to suspicion, have entirely forgotten that he is a minister of the Crown. From these statesmen, however, we have no intimation of the political motives of the Austrian Cabinet in this transaction,

and it is only by conjecture that any solution can be attempted of this singular problem.

We have, however, before us some pamphlets published in Germany long before the conclusion of the Concordat, denoting very plainly a tendency to the emancipation of the theocratic element in society, which is one of the most singular results of the convulsion of 1848. These writings are anonymous, but they are attributed to a well-known convert to the Roman Catholic faith and an ardent partisan of the counter-revolution named Jarcke, and they derive importance from the fact, that the Austrian Government has adopted and acted upon their opinions. One of them, entitled 'Church and State in Austria before, during, and after the Revolution of 1848,' is addressed in the form of a letter to the Consul of the United States at Vienna; and it is a characteristic circumstance that the writer considers the absolute freedom of the Roman Catholic Church in America, as the most perfect opportunity the world has ever beheld for the entire development of the Roman theory of ecclesiastical government.

Church establishments regulated by law are, on the contrary, an object of detestation to these writers, and no language appears to them too strong to describe the fatal consequences of Erastian principles on the world. The system of the Josephine laws is represented as having placed the people of Austria between the irreligious tendencies of modern infidelity and the strong control of the police, which alone deferred the coming revolution. This contradiction led, we are told, to a degree of bitter animosity against God and man, against Church and State, against authority and order, which is not to be conceived by any one who was not personally acquainted with the state of Austria before the March Revolution. Nay, more, the political disturbances which have in this century afflicted so many of the Catholic States in Europe — Spain, Portugal, France, Venice, Tuscany, Naples, and Austria herself, — are all traced back to the lawless encroachments of those States in the last century on the sacred prerogatives of the Church; and France more especially has expiated the abominations of Gallicanism by the hideous orgies of the Revolution!

'The absolutism of State Church law has, indeed, to its own destruction, weakened the efficiency of the Church in many lands and destroyed its influence over certain classes of society; but *Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat.*' (*Staat und Kirche in Oesterreich*, p. 31.)

Language of this sort is not unfamiliar to the student of history. It expresses that fervent conviction of the ascendancy

of the spiritual over the civil power, which broke out in the uncouth ravings of the Fifth Monarchy men, and has been handed down in the northern portion of this island from the fanatics of the Solemn League and Covenant to the enthusiasts of the Free Church of Scotland. It pervades, at this moment, the more vehement members of the High Church party in England who declaim against the Royal Supremacy; and it scorns to acknowledge any compact between the authority of the priesthood and the authority of the Crown. But it is a new and a strange occurrence to meet with this language under the sanction of the ministers of a Court jealous of its dignity, jealous of its rights, and including amongst those rights all that were ever termed '*jura majestatis circa sacra*.' Those who use it seem to forget that the Church they are willing to raise to a paramount authority is the very type of democratic despotism; and that the assertion by such a Church of rights superior to all the traditions of society and of law, is in truth a revolution subversive of monarchy and of the whole social compact.

This change has, however, not been suddenly brought about. The Revolution of 1848, and the fall of Prince Metternich, had satisfied the younger statesmen who assumed the government of the Empire that they had a novel and an arduous task before them; and they did not overlook the influence of the Church in restoring peace and order to the agitated surface of society. The Constitution of the 4th March, 1849, had recognised in general terms the right of self-government as inherent in all churches and ecclesiastical bodies, and an assembly of the Austrian bishops was convoked by the Minister of the Interior on the 29th April, 1849, which sat till the 17th June in deliberation on the interests of the Church. It is fair to remark that all the fundamental principles which have since been established in the form of the Concordat with Rome, were first asserted by this Episcopal Synod. The Imperial Government seems to have acquiesced in these sacerdotal claims without opposition, and to have conceded the main points before the negotiation with Rome was opened. Thus by a decree of the 18th April, 1850, the Emperor relieved the clergy from the control of the civil authority, both in their communications with the Pope, and with the inferior orders of the Church; and about the same time the Catholic schools were placed under more immediate ecclesiastical control. Count Thun, in his report to the Emperor of the 7th April, 1850, rests the changes he proposes to make on the promise given by the Constitution of the 4th March, and on the suggestions made by the Bishops in order to give effect to that engagement: and he expresses his resolu-

tion to maintain 'the well-earned rights of the sovereigns of Austria, which his Majesty's Government can never advise 'him to renounce.' But we confess our inability to discover that any guarantees have been taken for their protection. The idea of emancipating the Church entirely from the tutelary control of the State, and the idea of raising the Church into an independent barrier against the revolutionary spirit of the age, appear to have predominated in the minds of the Austrian ministers over every other consideration. They have yet, it seems, to learn that what they term the dominion of Christ, whose kingdom was not of this world, is, in reality, the dominion of ambitious and rapacious Italian priests, of antiquated laws, of corrupt jurisdictions, and of the most oppressive system which ever choked the mind and heart of man; and that to emancipate the priesthood from the salutary control of the law is to consign society itself to the most arbitrary and irresistible form of tyranny.

It may, however, be contended that by this signal act of submission to the full authority of the Church, the Imperial Government will henceforth reckon the Catholic clergy throughout its own dominions, and indeed in all other parts of the world, amongst its most devoted adherents; that in Italy more especially the Roman priesthood will become more Austrian than it has ever been before, and consequently more eagerly opposed not only to the extravagant republicanism of Mazzini, but to the free institutions of Sardinia, combining the two dreaded elements of resistance to the ascendancy of Austria and to that of the sacerdotal power; that in other parts of the Empire the organised authority and activity of the priesthood will afford an additional guarantee to that system of passive obedience which was effectually established throughout those provinces by the triumph of the Jesuits in the 17th century until it was shaken by the alarming convulsion of 1848; that in Germany this Concordat places Austria at the head of the Catholic party, and consequently in a more definite position of resistance to the Protestantism of the Prussian Court, and the rationalism which has partially undermined the faith of the German community; lastly, that the spirit of this measure strengthens the union of France and Austria as the two leading Catholic Powers, whose influence now divides the Italian Peninsula, and whose alliance has been carefully cultivated by Count Bupl, in opposition to the Russian power in the East and to that of the Protestant States in the North.

Beyond these suggestions we can discover no political motive of sufficient moment to account for the conduct of the Austrian

Cabinet; but it is probable that a large allowance must be made for the influence of superstition and fear upon the mind of the most illustrious person in the Empire. It is impossible to doubt the sincerity of a Prince who signs away without any ostensible motive large rights of sovereignty, defended by his ancestors and established by the laws of the realm; and if the Emperor knew what he was doing we can only attribute such a measure to an amount of veneration for the Holy See which was not often to be met with amongst the mediæval Princes of Europe, joined to a dread of revolutionary movements to which they were not exposed. In fact, the Emperor of Austria appears to have taken the theory of Ecclesiastical Supremacy in earnest; and we question whether another instance can be found of a Sovereign, since our own King John, giving the unconditional recognition to a theory so fatal to his own rights. Yet we have reason to believe that His Imperial Majesty has been himself the most zealous promoter of the measure, and that it would not have been carried without his decided personal authority.

It is vain to attempt to bring within the range of close argument speculations of this nature, and the apologists of the Concordat have carefully stood aloof from any such discussions, although their antagonists have not been slow to bring charges of gross political incapacity against the authors of the measure. Their doctrine is simply that the Church is invariably endeavouring to realise the ideal of Spiritual Power, which she derives from the will of God, and that the more she succeeds in this task the better it will be for the State. But the whole fabric rests on no foundation more substantial than these absurd and arrogant assumptions. The utility of the support of the Catholic clergy to the Government may without difficulty be admitted; but we are not aware that the clergy in Austria had ever failed in its duty to the State, or that it could do so under the Josephine laws, which claimed from the Church the most express obedience, and armed the State with power to enforce it. If the union of the State and the Church be the object desired, that object was more effectually obtained by the policy of Joseph than by a system which gives the two parties with distinct rights and leaves them to fight out their differences. This Concordat is not a measure of harmony, and peace, for neither the police nor the magistracy, neither the executive nor the judicial power, can be prepared quietly to acquiesce in the transfer of the authority which this instrument has transferred to the clergy. Within a few weeks of the exchange of ratifications, a dispute began with reference to the ecclesiastical ownership of books, and the Archbishop of Vienna maintained the public by prohibiting

the faithful from dancing in Advent. It is probable, therefore, that the effect of the Concordat even on the clergy will be to give rise to great dissatisfaction. Endless disputes will arise with the State, and the episcopal and parochial clergy will find themselves more and more prostrated under the authority of the regular Orders and the Papal Nunciature. In Italy the clergy may be more devoted than ever to the interests of the Court of Vienna, but the alliance is not a strong one which rests on the union of a detested foreign domination with an ecclesiastical tyranny which has lost all hold on the faith of the people.

It is, after all, by its effect on the welfare of the nation, on public opinion, and on the habits and interests of society, that even in Austria the Concordat must be judged. The experiment is a dangerous one; for whilst the State lends the Church its strength, the Church infects the State with her decrepitude; and it is very doubtful how far the opinions professed by the authors of the Concordat can be, or ever have been, entertained by the nation. To the non-Catholic subjects of the Empire, the measure is fraught with alarm; for although the apologists of the Concordat disclaim any design to interfere with the toleration enjoyed by the Protestant and Greek Churches, we find no pledge of this intention. In any case the effect, especially in Hungary and Transylvania, will certainly be to increase the fierce hostility already existing between those Churches and the Latin priesthood, and to induce them to look to Russia and the Protestant States for sympathy and protection. In Germany, Austria stands at the head of the Catholic States, but this Concordat is not regarded with satisfaction at Munich, in Baden, or by the Court of Dresden. These governments had often contended with Rome, and had refused to concede many of the points which Austria has now surrendered; but it becomes extremely difficult for the minor Catholic Powers in Germany to defend rights which their Imperial head has resigned. These very points had been recently the subject of a dispute between the Bishop of Fribourg (in Brigau) and the Government of Baden, in which the Government had the full support and approval of the people against the violence and arrogance of the Prelate. Still less are the principles of the Concordat acceptable to the Catholic laity in other parts of Germany, where discussion is more free, education more diffused, and the sense of German nationality far more powerful than in the Austrian States. It is impossible that every member of that laity should not feel that the Concordat is a great act of aggression by the Court of Rome on the historical independence of Germany—by

the canonists on those social rights which have hitherto been granted and protected by the State—by the Roman Catholic priesthood on the spirit of free inquiry—and by the immutable despotism of the Church upon the progress of the human mind. ‘Jesus Christ,’ exclaimed Görres in a fit of eloquent enthusiasm, ‘declared that he built his Church upon a Rock; he did not say ‘that the Church should petrify all around her.’ But Rome has said for the Church what was never promulgated by her Divine Founder; and the effect of institutions such as those contemplated by the authors of this Concordat would be the petrification of society. By a significant coincidence, within a few weeks of the exchange of ratifications at Vienna, our honoured friend Chevalier Bunsen put forth at Heidelberg his energetic and soul-stirring protest in defence of the religious liberties of Germany under the title of the ‘*Sign of the Times*.’ Thousands of copies of this production have been scattered over the land, and the nation feels that it is challenged to no ordinary contest. The German nation has shown little energy and little perseverance in the assertion of its political liberties; but the freedom most essential to the mind of Germany is the freedom of philosophical discussion, and the pursuit of a theory absolutely opposed to that of Rome. There is something ludicrous in an arrangement which places the spiritual powers of Italy above the most learned and original thinkers of Germany; and whilst Northern Italy groans under the burden of German soldiers, Rome retaliates, by subjecting Southern Germany to Italian priests.

We commenced these observations by pointing out the aggressive policy of the present Pope, and the daring with which Pius IX. has been impelled to carry on the operations of the Church militant whether in countries subservient to his will or repugnant to his authority. The Austrian Concordat is the most conspicuous example of this policy, for it has placed on record in the 19th century principles, as absolute as those contended for in the darkest ages of the world; it has thrown aside, and we hope for ever, that affected moderation, in which Rome had, of late years disguised her claims; and it has challenged the temporal powers that rule the world to a more open warfare. The claims of Rome are not confined to Austria, nor are they one whit less extensive in every other country, whether Catholic or Protestant; they reach beyond the pale of the Church—beyond the confines of Christianity and civilisation—they compass the spiritual government of the world. This, therefore, is not an Austrian question, or a German question, or even a Catholic question, or a European question

only: it embraces every State and every people, for there is none in which the agents of Rome are not contending for the same mastery and exercising, in different degrees, the same power. It includes lands yet uninhabited, races yet unborn, and the future destinies of society. Freedom itself, when it has been liberally conceded by the tolerance of the age to the institutions of the Church of Rome, is converted by her art into a weapon of oppression; and the franchises she invokes are wrested from the liberties of man. We have studiously abstained from all allusion to the theological tenets of that Church, or even to her claim to infallibility in defining the true objects of the faith. That subject lies altogether beyond the proper object of these pages; but the revival of ecclesiastical power, and the attempt to engraft ecclesiastical despotism on dogmatical infallibility, is the concern of every man who is not already enslaved. That power has been resisted alike by Catholic and Protestant sovereigns, by Catholic and by Protestant laws; it is a usurpation, under a pretended divine right, upon every legitimate form of government; and to judge from these recent events, it will never cease to be the duty of nations jealous of freedom to vindicate their independence against the encroachments of so indefatigable an antagonist.

ART. VI.—1. *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton.* By Sir DAVID BREWSTER, K.H., F.R.S., &c. &c. 2 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh and London: 1855.

2. *Correspondence of Sir Isaac Newton and Professor Cotes.* Edited by J. EDLESTON, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 1 vol. 8vo. London and Cambridge: 1850.

3. *Analytical View of Sir Isaac Newton's Principia.* By HENRY LORD BROUGHAM, F.R.S., &c. &c.; and E. J. ROUTH, B.A., Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. 1 vol. 8vo. London: 1855.

THE long-promised appearance of a Life of Newton, upon a scale somewhat commensurate with the demands of so illustrious a subject, cannot but be regarded as an event of some consequence in our national scientific literature. The promise on the part of its author has, we believe, been in abeyance since the appearance of his former small volume in the series of the 'Family Library,' in 1831. As to the causes of this delay we have little information; but at least some part of the

time has been worthily employed in a laborious search into original documents not hitherto examined. In the interval also several publications have appeared tending to throw great light on the subject. The late Professor Rigaud's * * Essay on the 'History of the First Publication of the Principia'; his editorial labours in printing the correspondence of Newton and his contemporaries from the Macclesfield collection; and more recently Mr. Edleston's similar volume of the correspondence with Cotes, preserved in Trinity College library; besides the critical researches of Professor De Morgan, — have all furnished most important aid towards an accurate history of Newton's life: and of all these and many other sources of information Sir D. Brewster has made ample and judicious use.

The history of Newton is in a great measure the history of science, and of the most important epoch in all the history of science. Great as that epoch was, and important as were the events which characterised it, they are already so perfectly known to all who take the slightest interest in the progress of human intellect, that we shall think it needless here to retrace them in detail. We shall rather avail ourselves of the vast mass of information now before us to present to our readers what will, perhaps, prove a more generally attractive view of the private life of the author of those discoveries; and we shall endeavour to extract from it what may serve to convey a more just and correct idea of his real personal character, habits, and pursuits than has been commonly entertained.

In a pleasant situation, about six miles south of Grantham in Lincolnshire, lies the parish and village of Colsterworth, a dependent hamlet of which, called Woolsthorpe, boasts the honours of a distinct manor. The domain is, however, limited to a very small expanse, and the manorial mansion is of corresponding dimensions, existing to this day as it stood upwards of two centuries ago; in fact possessing no apparent pretensions beyond those of a second-rate farm house, though substantially built of stone, after the fashion naturally prevalent in the belite formations. The possessors of this estate, in the earlier part of the seventeenth century, were a family named Newton, rumoured to have been of Scottish extraction; and to have come to England with King James I.; who subsisted on the cultivation of the small farm, occupying no higher station than that of not very substantial yeomen. The estate of Woolsthorpe was estimated at only 30*l.* per annum in 1628.

They continued, however, undisturbed in that retreat during the troubled times which England was beginning to experience about 1642. But in that year the then representative of the family, Isaac Newton, having succeeded his father in the inheritance little more than a year before, died only a few months after his marriage with Hannah Ayscough, and in the prime of life, leaving his widow in a delicate situation, the result of which was, that at a premature period, on Christmas-day, she gave birth to a diminutive son, in such a feeble state that some attendants, hastily despatched for medical aid, were astonished to find him alive on their return. He was named Isaac after his father. The widow possessed in her own right the adjacent farm of Sewsterne, estimated at 50*l.* per annum. On the modest income of these united domains she proceeded to rear and educate her son, with no better prospects for him than that of becoming in due time her assistant and successor in the cultivation of the soil.

She was described as a 'singularly good woman.' And within three years after her bereavement it so happened that the Rev. Barnabas Smith, rector of the adjoining parish of North Witham, who had lived long as an old bachelor, was advised by his parishioners to marry her; but not understanding such matters, he paid one of his advisers a day's wages to go and make the proposal for him. It was, after due reflection, accepted; but, with proper caution, the farm of Sewsterne was settled upon little Isaac. In 1645 his mother removed to North Witham. But his maternal grandmother occupied the house at Woolsthorpe, and took upon herself the entire care of the delicate child. His health prospered under her auspices; and in a few years he was able to acquire such rudiments of education as the adjoining village schools at Skillington and at Stoke could furnish.

His mother's marriage was followed by the birth of a son, Benjamin, and of two daughters, Mary and Hannah. These individuals and their descendants are often referred to in the course of the memoirs before us. Young Isaac's health became more robust than could have been expected; and at the age of twelve he was in a condition to be sent to the Grammar School at Grantham, then presided over by Mr. Stokes. We must presume that his step-father furnished some aid towards his education, as we find that this step involved his boarding in Grantham at the house of an apothecary named Clarke. Here, however, instead of attending to his lessons in the school, he began to evince a decided taste for the more practical arts of carpentering and making mechanical contrivances. By degrees these operations were of a kind which attracted

notice; and he gained a considerable celebrity for ingenious models of a mill worked by a mouse put into a tread wheel; — a water-clock, and other devices. In his visits to Woolsthorpe his ingenuity was displayed in connexion with some notions of a more scientific kind, in the construction of sun dials, two of which were cut in the stones of the wall of the manor-house, and have been carefully preserved to this day. It is also stated that he acquired considerable skill in drawing, the walls of his room at Mr. Clarke's being covered with designs of various kinds. He is said also to have written verses, but the account is somewhat apocryphal.

During the later period of his residence at Grantham a development of his character of a different kind occurred. A relative of his landlord, a certain young lady designated as Mistress Storey, of unusual personal attractions, was an inmate in the house. He was then not fifteen years of age, and the lady three years younger; nevertheless, a flirtation ensued, which, according to her own statement, continued unabated even at a more reasonable age; when, however, prudential motives opposed that inexorable barrier which so often cruelly mars human happiness. The lady, however, consoled herself afterwards by twice marrying; notwithstanding that the attentions of her first lover continued to be displayed, sometimes in a very substantial manner, to the end of his life.

In 1656, when Isaac was fifteen years of age, his step-father died; his mother, with her children, returned to reside at Woolsthorpe, and Isaac was recalled from school to manage the farm. In this novel occupation he was aided by a trusty servant. They went together to market at Grantham: the servant to transact all the business, the young master to return to Mr. Clarke's garret and continue at once his studies and his courtship. At other times he was found intrenched under a hedge, absorbed in calculation or constructing machines, while the sheep were straying, and the cattle breaking the fences and trampling on the corn. In the terrible storm on the day of the death of Oliver Cromwell, in 1658, he was deeply engaged in studying the force of the wind, and measuring it by making a number of successive leaps in the direction against it compared with the number made in its direction, in the same time. His prudent mother soon saw that this state of things could not go on; and his uncle, the Rev. Mr. Ayscough, perceiving the bent of his mind, urged the propriety of his going to Cambridge; and, in consequence, he returned to Grantham school, where he now seems to have pursued his studies in a more earnest spirit; and, at the period of leaving the school, the master, in the

height of satisfaction at his progress and auguries of his future success; with a kind of formal ceremonial, in a speech delivered to the assembled school, took leave of him, and held him up to the admiration and imitation of the scholars.

We might be surprised at a person in the circumstances of Mrs. Smith thinking of sending a son to the University. But it must be remembered that the mode of life in those seminaries was very different at that period from what it has since become. And, moreover, the situation of *sizar* in colleges offered advantages precisely such as persons in Isaac Newton's condition would gladly avail themselves of. It held out a maintenance of a kind with which he might well be contented; and coupled as it was with the performance of some menial services, these were, at any rate, far less unpleasant than the labours of the farm, to which he had so invincible an aversion. Therefore armed with letters of introduction from his uncle, he presented himself at Trinity College, in June 1661, and was there admitted sub-sizar, and matriculated as sizar July 8th in the same year.

Considering his small pecuniary resources we are surprised, in looking at the entries in some account books of this period which have been preserved, to find not only a number of loans to different friends and relatives, but some items most conscientiously headed, '*Otiose and frustra expensa*;' which include some curious entries: '*China-ale*' (*q. tea?*), cherries, tarts, bottled beer, '*marmelot*,' '*sherbet and reasks*,' cake, &c. showing that he was not altogether of a very self-denying disposition; though, at a little later period, the sequel contains similar notices of money '*spent on my cousin Ayscough and on other acquaintances*,' besides loans to other friends, and '*oranges for my sister*;' indicating a spirit of generosity towards his relatives of which in after life he gave more noble examples.

Of the details of his life at Cambridge during the first years of his residence unfortunately very few particulars have been preserved. Mr. Edleston incidentally informs us, that Newton's tutor was Benjamin Pulleyn.* This individual seems to have proceeded judiciously. In the first instance, his pupils being called upon to attend a logic lecture, he found that Newton had already become so complete a proficient in Saunderson's Logic, which he had studied before leaving home, that he dispensed with further attendance on that lecture, and, instead of it, placed him in a class reading Kepler's Optics. Newton, how-

* Introd. p. xli

ever, we are told, mastered the whole book before the rest had proceeded but a little way. He was, in fact, principally his own tutor. He went to Stourbridge fair, and there bought a book on Judicial Astrology, to understand which he found it necessary to know more mathematics than he had yet acquired. He therefore commenced studying Euclid; but not liking the tediousness of long demonstrations to prove what he considered self-evident, he flew to the more attractive and generalised investigations of Des Cartes's Geometry, in such a way as fairly to awaken his inventive powers and lead him to attempt original solutions of a variety of problems. Of these studies, fortunately, some notice is preserved in several common-place books still extant, in which a variety of inquiries of this kind are entered in a rather promiscuous manner.

He was elected scholar April 28th, 1664, and in January, 1665, took the degree of B.A. Before that period the practice had begun of classifying the incepting bachelors in what is called the 'ordo senioritatis,' and which now constitutes the tripos, or list of honours: Mr. Edleston, however, informs us, that this estimate of the relative proficiency of the candidates is most provokingly omitted in the record of that year when, of all others, it would be so peculiarly interesting to possess it.

The eventful years 1665-6, marked by the fearful calamities of the plague and of the fire of London, were equally full of interesting events of a very different kind in the world of science; though, from the peculiarity of the circumstances, that interest was not excited, — the very occurrences hardly known till many years afterwards. All that appeared to external observation was the simple fact that Isaac Newton, now a scholar of Trinity College and B. A., was in his usual odd, desultory way, deeply absorbed in certain mathematical researches, which (as was long afterwards discovered when the memorials of these researches were first brought to light), led him to a certain method of calculating, by rules perfectly general, various questions which all preceding mathematicians had attempted only by partial methods and isolated modes of solution, and even giving an unlimited extension of the means of solving a vast variety of problems relative to all parts of physical and geometrical inquiries: a method which was called 'Fluxions,' and under one form or another has been the sole instrument of the modern discoveries.

We have now extant not less than four brief MS. tracts, all nearly to the same purport, though somewhat differing in details, giving the outline of the method alluded to, with many of its applications, in his own handwriting, bearing date in

1665-6, together with a larger essay, 1671. These long remained wholly unknown.

It is true another paper on a subject nearly allied, and containing some of the same *results*, was, a few years later, privately shown to Dr. Barrow, and by him to Collins (then a sort of centre of communication among European mathematicians), through whom it became known; but this did not convey any intimation of the *method*. Thus the great discovery of fluxions remained for years unnoticed and unknown; thrown aside after its inventor had sufficiently satisfied himself by repeated transcriptions; and then forgotten, as soon as newer and more attractive researches tempted him.

In the summer of the same year the spreading of the plague to Cambridge caused the necessary measure of dismissing the colleges. This was again repeated in the following year; the intervening winter being probably deemed a sufficiently safe season to allow residence to be resumed. It is by no means certain on which of these occasions the memorable incident of the fall of the apple occurred. Sir D. Brewster inclines to suppose it was in 1666. The story, in fact, rests chiefly on the authority of a lady (Newton's favourite niece), who figures considerably at a later period of his history, and who would hardly have failed to learn its truth from the fountain-head before she repeated it. It is no argument against its truth that Newton did not mention it to Whiston or Pemberton when engaged in commenting on his discoveries, as it would have little to do with their objects. A writer of somewhat later date, Mr. Green, of Clare Hall (who published some strange theories which he called the Greenian Philosophy), mentions the story on the authority of Martin Foulkes, P. R. S., and adds, '*uti omnis cognitio nostra, a pomo.*'

Be this as it may, it is not every reasoner who would have argued from the fall of bodies to the earth that the moon is every moment falling directly to the earth, by exactly the same quantity as an apple removed to the same distance would do; or would thence have been led to the theory of universal gravity, perceiving that this same centripetal, combined with a tangential or impulsive force, in certain proportions, must cause a body to move in an orbit: or that if the centripetal force be inversely as the square of the distance that orbit must be an ellipse, and to show by exact calculation that this agrees with all the observed motions of the moon, the planets, satellites, and comets.

All this, however, was not discovered in the garden at

Woolsthorpe. The germ of the idea alone was then developed; the trial of it by calculation was not made till considerably later. Like many of the other great ideas which in rapid succession presented themselves to Newton's mind about this period, they engaged his inquiries but for a short time, and were then thrown aside.

Thus in the beginning of 1666 and, probably, when at Cambridge, Newton tells us that he purchased a glass prism 'to try therewith the celebrated phenomenon of colours.' Again in an account-book under the date of 1667 is entered a purchase of *three* prisms, costing one shilling each. But there does not appear any positive evidence (as Sir D. Brewster thinks) for assigning the date of the actual discovery of the unequal refrangibility of light at this precise period: it even appears most probable that he had not yet made the discovery in 1669, since in that year he had the revision of Dr. Barrow's Optical Lectures before their publication, which contain assertions quite at variance with that doctrine, and which he would hardly have allowed his friend to publish without remonstrance had he been then in possession of the true theory. Nevertheless Mr. Edleston, who is in general a model of accuracy, unhesitatingly sets down this great discovery as the work of the year 1666.

It is certain that to whatever extent Newton proceeded at that time, his researches were again interrupted by the appearance of the plague, and he was again driven from Cambridge. But even if these researches went no further than the general idea, we must mark the epoch as one singularly distinguished by the coincident development of even the first rudiments of three such grand conceptions, each in its department destined to revolutionise the face of science, and all due to the suggestions of one master mind, the first fruits of the youthful and as yet untried energies of a student then in his twenty-fifth year. Yet all this passed at the time in the quiet of Woolsthorpe or the interior of Newton's college rooms, exciting neither remark, surprise, nor commendation beyond, perhaps, the praise bestowed by Barrow on the paper which he sent to Collins, mentioning that 'the name of the author is Newton, a Fellow of our College, who, with an unparalleled genius, has made very great progress in this branch of mathematics.'

In October 1667 Newton was elected 'minor fellow of Trinity College,' and in the following year 'major fellow;' which he also took the degree of M. A. Notwithstanding the high celebrity which he obtained even during his residence in

Cambridge, it is remarkable how few details have been preserved of his mode of life; and that even on the subject of the locality of his rooms in college some doubts should exist. Those which he occupied as an undergraduate are unknown. On his nomination to a fellowship the rooms assigned to him were what was called 'the Spiritual Chamber,' the position of which is at this day matter of mere conjecture. The only locality certainly traced is that of the rooms he finally occupied from 1682 till he quitted the University. These are situated not far from the former, and, like others at that part of the College, have a small piece of garden inclosed within the high walls which there shut out Trinity College from the street, just to the north of the great gateway. In this garden a small wooden building projected from the rooms,—having an alcove under it; and at the end of the garden next the chapel was a laboratory. The whole is represented in Sir D. Brewster's work copied in a wood-cut from Loggan's print with all its wonderful impossibilities of perspective. The exterior has in late years undergone some changes, but stood as represented within the memory of Professor Sedgwick.

In the account-books and memoranda there repeatedly occurs the name of Da. Wickins (not Dr. as Sir D. Brewster prints it in one or two places, but Dominus — the college appellation of a B. A., expressed also in English by Sir Wickins). Newton, during his undergraduateship, or soon after, was in rooms with a 'chum.' That mode of life might be pleasant if the 'chums' happened to be mutually congenial; but if not, a brace of coupled hounds could not lead a more distracting existence. Newton's chum was unhappily a most noisy, idle, and ill-conducted youth: accordingly the philosopher strolled out disconsolate into the college walks, there to meditate in quiet over his problems. In those walks he several times encountered a fellow collegian looking as dismal as himself. The freemasonry of sympathy brought on conversation; and it was discovered that in both the cause of unhappiness was the same,—an uncongenial chum. The principle of elective affinity happily prevailed: the mutually sympathetic parties made a double exchange, by which both were gainers, and Newton and Wickins became chums and friends for life; while their roystering companions were made equally happy together. Da. Wickins did not always remain a bachelor, and his son has left on record this circumstance, as well as many particulars of his father's friend, from which we will extract a few points:—

'I have often heard my father say that he has been a witness of what the world has so often heard, of Sir Isaac's forgetfulness of his

food when intent upon his studies; and of his rising in a pleasant manner, with the satisfaction of having found out some proposition, without any concern for a seeming want of his night's sleep, which he was sensible he had lost thereby. . . . He was turning grey, I think, at thirty; and when my father observed that to him, as the effect of his deep attention of mind, he would jest with the experiments he made so often with quicksilver; as if from hence he took so soon that colour. . . . He sometimes suspected himself to be inclining to a consumption, and the medicine he made use of was the Leucatello's balsam, which, when he had composed himself, he would now and then melt, in quantity about a quarter of a pint, and so drink it.

The recipe as recorded in his own hand is also given; and we are also informed that Mrs. Vincent (the *ci-devant* Miss Storey, Newton's juvenile charmer), told Dr. Stukely that Sir Isaac was a great 'simpler.' The Doctor says, 'his breakfast was orange-peel boiled in water, which he drank as tea, sweetened with sugar, and with bread and butter. He thinks this dissolves phlegm.' Several other instances of his medicinal practice (happily exercised only on himself) are also recorded; and, to turn to a higher feature of his character, Mr. Wickins also dilates on some instances of his charitable liberality, which passed privately through his father's hands, especially a donation of bibles to the poor of the parish of which he was the minister.

In the absence of detailed information as to Newton's actual pursuits about this period, we are left in doubt to what extent he carried on those experimental labours, implying considerable chemical and physical resources, which he called his 'glass works,' and which were directed towards the improvement of telescopes, before 1667. We have entries in his early account books of money spent on sundry tools, and on putty, and other materials for grinding and polishing lenses: but on the discovery of the unequal refrangibility of light (not as yet disclosed to any human being) he soon perceived its necessary consequence, — that of causing colour, and in consequence confused images, at the focus. While in accordance with the assumption he had not unnaturally adopted, in the first instance, that all dispersion must be proportional to the refraction, he concluded the impossibility of correcting such colour, and pronounced any further improvement of refracting telescopes 'desperate.' He was thus led to the idea of reflecting instruments. Gregory and Cassegrain had a little before proposed telescopes on this principle; but Newton attempted a different, a more simple, and more effective construction, in 1668: and in 1671, his first complete instrument, of about six and a half inches focal length, was sent up

to the Royal Society, where it is still carefully preserved; and was submitted also to the 'perusal' of the king. This led to his admission into the Royal Society in 1672. The Newtonian construction has superseded all others; and in the present age has been adopted with only a slight modification in the gigantic instruments of Herschel and Lord Rosse. Yet the disclosure of this invention was in a way extorted from him, and he expressly says 'had not the communication been desired I might have let it still remain in private as it hath already done some years!' This, however, was but an exemplification of the same spirit of reserve which he manifested on many other occasions.

Meanwhile, in 1669, Dr. Barrow resigned the Lucasian professorship of mathematics with the express view that Newton might succeed him; and on receiving this appointment, he relinquished his optical labours, and resumed his researches, rather of a miscellaneous character, in pure mathematics. These researches gave rise to much correspondence with Collins, which in several instances curiously illustrates his peculiarities of intellectual character. In one of his letters he complains of 'mathematical speculations' as 'at least dry, if not somewhat barren;' and again, when Collins pressed him to allow the solution of certain problems he had communicated to him to be inserted in the Philosophical Transactions, he gives that permission only on condition that, 'it be without his name to it.' For, he adds, 'I see not what there is desirable in public esteem were I able to acquire and maintain it. It would perhaps increase my acquaintance, the thing which I chiefly study to decline.'

In the same year 1672, he was induced to communicate to the Royal Society what he termed in a previous letter to the secretary, Oldenburgh, 'an account of a philosophical discovery, being the oddest if not the most considerable detection which hath hitherto been made in the operations of nature.' This was in fact the full development of the unequal refrangibility of the colour-making elements of which white light consists. The series of elaborate experiments by which he further established it, and traced out all its consequences, formed the subjects of several subsequent papers. No sooner was a discovery announced involving ideas at that time so startling and paradoxical, than it excited vehement opposition from various philosophers wedded to received views. The theory was cavilled at, the experiments were declared fallacious*; more

accurate trials were alleged to subvert the conclusions; and Newton found himself, to his utter dismay and disgust, drawn into controversy on every side. It was not that he grudged the labour of repeating experiments or writing new arguments to prove the soundness of his conclusions. For all this he probably thought and cared nothing; the one annoyance, the standing grievance, was that his tranquillity was disturbed, and that he was dragged into the arena of public conflict. He could not be allowed to pursue his studies in peace for his own private satisfaction and enjoyment. He cared little for the fame which was to reward his discoveries. He valued little the triumph, complete as it was, which he gained over his assailants. But he could not bear to be obliged to come out into the public gaze. He thought nothing of the benefit he was conferring on the human race in comparison with the enjoyment of his own serenity.

Thus he writes to Oldenburgh: —

‘I intend to be no further solicitous about matters of philosophy: and, therefore, I hope you will not take it ill if you never find me doing anything more in that kind; or rather that you will favour me in my determination, by preventing, so far as you can conveniently, any objections, or other philosophical letters, that may concern me.’

And somewhat later again: —

‘I see I have made myself a slave to philosophy; but if I get free of Mr. Linus’s business, I will resolutely bid adieu to it eternally, excepting what I do for my private satisfaction or leave to come out after me: for I see a man must either resolve to put out nothing new, or to become a slave to defend it.’

And at a much later period, he thus looks back (writing to Leibnitz,) at his past troubles: —

‘I was so persecuted with discussions arising out of my theory of light that I blamed my own imprudence for parting with so substantial a blessing as my quiet, to run after a shadow.’

On the strength of these and similar testimonies, Sir D. Brewster* thinks that, wearied and disgusted with science, Newton now seriously turned his thoughts to the study of the law; a supposition which he appears to adopt chiefly on the ground that Newton is said to have been a candidate for a civil law fellowship of his college in 1673; but this, though involving the obligation to graduate in civil law, does not imply the practice of that profession, and it is obvious such a fellowship might be an object to him if, as seems likely, he had an ob-

jection to taking orders which an ordinary fellowship would oblige him to do when of a certain standing.

The case is also connected with a story, often repeated, of an individual named Uvedale, whose sole claim to an immortality of fame is the fact of his having been the successful competitor for the fellowship in question against Newton. Mr. Edleston designates the story as 'a myth.*' Uvedale, however, was a real man, he was elected; and he proceeded with the study of the civil law. Mr. Edleston argues that the fellowship was not given to Newton on the ground that it would not have been compatible with the duties of his professorship. Yet the same reason would seem equally, or even more applicable against his retaining an ordinary fellowship, which involved the obligation of taking orders and studying divinity. The statutes of the Lucasian professorship had been not long before confirmed and subsequently enlarged by the King; and, in 1675, at Newton's earnest solicitation, a royal patent was obtained conferring the additional privilege of dispensing with the obligation of taking orders involved in any fellowship which the Lucasian professor might hold. Newton thus continued to enjoy his fellowship notwithstanding the far-famed victory of Mr. Uvedale.

Another character now appears on the stage, or rather in the witness-box, who was eminently capable from his peculiar position of bearing testimony to Newton's private habits and pursuits. The individual in question is Humphrey Newton, who is described as 'of Grantham,' and, probably, was one of the many poor relations who often experienced the generosity of their distinguished kinsman. At any rate he was an inmate in Newton's rooms; but whether as a sizar or academical servitor, or as a simple assistant and amanuensis, does not appear. At all events, in 1683, he commenced residence and entered on his duties, and he has left behind him some highly curious and characteristic records of his employer or tutor. They are delivered in a quaint, simple, and desultory style; and in the same form we will present a few particulars to our readers. Thus as to Newton's personal appearance and manners:—

'His carriage was very meek, sedate, and humble; never seemingly angry, of profound thought, his countenance mild, pleasant, and comely. I cannot say I ever saw him laugh but once, which was at that passage which Dr. Stukely mentioned in his letter (and which is described thus):—"Twice upon occasion of asking a friend, to whom he had lent Euclid to read, what progress he had

made in his author, and how he liked him? He answered, by desiring to know what use and benefit in life that study would be to him; upon which Sir Isaac was very merry.'

Again: Newton—

'Always kept close to his studies, very rarely went a visiting, and had as few visitors, excepting two or three persons, Mr. Ellis, Mr. Laughton of Trinity, and Mr. Viganí, a chemist, in whose society he took much delight and pleasure at an evening when he came to wait upon him. I never knew him to take any recreation or pastime, either in riding out to take the air, walking, bowling, or any other exercise whatever; thinking all hours lost that were not spent in his studies, to which he kept so close that he seldom left his chamber except at term time, when he read in the schools, as being Lucasianus professor; where so few went to hear him, and fewer that understood him, that oftentimes he did in a manner for want of hearers, read to the walls.' . . . 'Foreigners he received with a great deal of freedom, candour, and respect. When invited to a treat, which was very seldom, he used to return it very handsomely, and with much satisfaction to himself. So intent, so serious upon his studies that he ate very sparingly, nay, oftentimes he has forgot to eat at all; so that going into his chamber, I have found his mess untouched, of which, when I have reminded him, he would reply, "Have I!" and then, making to the table, would eat a bit or two standing; for I cannot say I ever saw him sit at table by himself. At some seldom entertainments the masters of colleges were chiefly his guests.' . . . 'I cannot say I ever saw him drink either wine, ale, or beer, excepting at meals, and then but very sparingly. He very rarely went to dine in the hall, except on some public days; and then, if he has not been minded, would go very carelessly with shoes down at heel, stockings untied, surplice on, and his hair scarcely combed.' . . . 'He very seldom went to the chapel; that being the time he chiefly took his repose; and as for the afternoon, his earnest and indefatigable studies retained him, so that he scarcely knew the house of prayer. Very frequently, on Sundays, he went to St. Mary's church, especially in the forenoon.' . . . 'In his chamber he walked so very much that you might have thought him to be educated at Athens among the Aristotelian sect.'

In further proof of his absence of mind we have the additional testimony of Dr. Stukely:—

'When he had friends to entertain, if he went into his study to fetch a bottle of wine there was danger of his forgetting them. He would sometimes put on his surplice to go to St. Mary's church. When he was going home to Colsterworth, from Grantham he once led his horse up Spittlegate Hill at the town end. When he designed to remount, his horse had slipped the bridle and gone away without his perceiving it, and he had only the bridle in his hand all the

Humphrey Newton continues:—

‘He very seldom sat by the fire in his chamber, excepting that long frosty winter (1683-4) which made him creep to it against his will. I believe he grudged the short time he spent in eating and sleeping. . . . In a morning he seemed to be as much refreshed with his few hours’ sleep, as though he had taken a whole night’s rest. . . . He kept neither dog nor cat in his chamber, which made well for the old woman, his bedmaker; she faring much the better for it; for in a morning she has sometimes found both dinner and supper scarcely tasted of, which the old woman has very pleasantly and mumpingly gone away with. . . . In winter time he was a lover of apples; and sometimes at night would eat a small roasted quince.

As for his private prayers I can say nothing of them. I am apt to believe that his intense studies deprived him of the better part. His behaviour was mild and meek, without anger, peevishness, or passion,—so free from that, that you might take him for a Stoick. I have seen a small pastboard box in his study, set against the open window, no less as one might suppose than a thousand guineas in it, crowded edgeways; whether this was suspicion or carelessness I cannot say: perhaps to try the fidelity of those about him. . . . He was very charitable; few went empty-handed from him. . . . No way litigious, not given to law or vexatious suits, taking patience to be the best law, and a good conscience the best divinity.

‘He was very curious in his garden, which was never out of order; in which he would at seldom times take a short walk or two, not enduring to see a weed in it. It was kept in order by a gardener. I scarcely ever saw him do anything, as pruning, &c., at it himself. When he has sometimes taken a turn or two he has made a sudden stand, turned himself about, run up the stairs like another Archimedes with an *εὕρηκα*, falling to write on his desk standing, without giving himself the leisure to draw a chair to sit down on.’

His gardening taste is, perhaps, a new feature in the imaginary picture we form of him. It is fully corroborated by some letters, which Sir D. Brewster has given at length, in which we find him anxiously and critically dilating on the best varieties of apple from which to obtain grafts, and expressing a wise preference for the genuine ‘red streaks.’

Now comes one of the most curious particulars of honest Humphrey’s disclosures:—

‘He very rarely went to bed till two or three of the clock; sometimes not till five or six,—lying about four or five hours; especially at spring and fall of the leaf, at which times he used to employ about six weeks in his laboratory, the fire scarcely going out either night or day;—he sitting up one night and I another, till he had finished his chemical experiments, in the performance of which he was the most accurate, strict, exact.* What his aim might be I was not able to penetrate into; but his pains, his diligence at these

set times, made me think he aimed at *something beyond the reach of human art and industry*. . . . On the left end of the garden was his laboratory, near the east end of the chapel, where he at these set times employed himself in with a great deal of satisfaction and delight. Nothing extraordinary, as I can remember, happened in making his experiments; which if there did, he was of so sedate and even temper, that I could not in the least discover it.

'About six weeks at spring and six at fall the fire in the laboratory scarcely went out, which was well furnished with chymical materials, as bodies, receivers, heads, crucibles, &c., which was made very little use of—the crucibles excepted, in which he fused his metals. He would sometimes, though very seldom, look into an old mouldy book, which lay in his laboratory. I think it was titled "*Agricola de Metallis*;" *the transmuting of metals being his chief design*. For which purposes antimony was a great ingredient. . . . His brick furnaces, *pro re natâ*, he made and altered himself, without troubling a bricklayer.'

The surmises of his simple-minded assistant were undoubtedly correct; and we have a somewhat new light thrown on Newton's turn of mind, when we learn that *he was really devoted to ALCHEMY*. Indeed if his honest amanuensis was correct in the matter of the guineas in the pasteboard box, we should be inclined to believe he had really succeeded in the occult art; since it is difficult to imagine from what possible source he could have amassed such a sum. Be this as it may, the testimony to his alchemical tendencies rests on other authority than that of honest Humphrey's mere surmises. We are at least certain that he had largely studied the subject; and if he expresses himself sometimes with caution, or even doubt, this must be allowed as a not unnatural exhibition of reserve on a subject on which he was doubtless unwilling to avow the extent of his convictions or expectations.

In his letter of advice to Mr. Aston on his travels, Newton exhorts him to inquire particularly into anything he can learn abroad as to transmutation of metals, which he says are 'the most luciferous, and many times lucriferous experiments too, in philosophy.' And he also expresses a peculiar interest respecting one Bory, in Holland, a noted alchemist, who, he thinks, possesses important secrets.

At a subsequent period Boyle, who had been engaged in similar pursuits, communicated to Newton and other friends the discovery of a certain 'red earth,' which, by combination with mercury, was to multiply gold. A specimen of it was sent to Newton, who at first seemed to doubt, yet intimates an intention of shortly trying it, 'though the success seems improbable.' He afterwards hints that Boyle 'had reserved a part of the process from my knowledge, though I knew more of it than

'he has told me.' On another occasion Boyle communicated other experiments, which Newton says, 'he cumbered with such circumstances as startled me, and made me afraid of any more.'

Mr. Law states that he found among Sir Isaac's papers large extracts out of Jacob Behmen, from whose writings he had been led to search for 'the philosopher's tincture;' and that this was the object of the chemical labours which he prosecuted in conjunction with his relative Dr. Newton.

Sir D. Brewster has seen *, in Newton's hand-writing, copies and extracts of several alchemical works, such as John De Monte Snyders' 'Metamorphoses of the Planets,' Norton's 'Ordinal,' and Basil Valentine's 'Mystery of the Microcosm,' and others: also a copy of the 'Secrets Revealed, or an Open Entrance to the Shut Palace of the King,' covered with MS. notes in Sir Isaac's hand, and suggested emendations of the text; and, besides these, a small work, an original of his own, as we are led to suppose, entitled 'Thesaurus Thesaurorum, sive Medecina Aurea;' together with innumerable note books and detached MS. papers, containing an infinity of extracts, and remarks on all parts of the subject, and a minute 'Index Chemicus,' with a supplement of extensive references to writings and authorities. This, then, seems to have been the absorbing passion of his life, at least about the period of which we are speaking. Engaged in such an engrossing pursuit he threw aside fluxions, optics, and gravitation; and, with the glowing vision of the philosopher's stone before his eyes, was blind to all prospects of sublunary fame or distinction, and desired nothing in life but the peaceful seclusion of his laboratory and the uninterrupted enjoyment of the pursuit of the grand arcanum.

From the date of 1666 it is clear Newton had laid aside his speculations concerning gravitation. There has been much difficulty in ascertaining the dates of the subsequent steps by which he finally arrived at his grand conclusion. At a later period he tells us that he had formerly made an attempt to test the theory by calculation in the instance of the moon's orbit, but not finding it accurate enough, he had ceased to attend to the subject. All things considered, it seems most probable, that in 1679, in consequence of some queries and suggestions of Hooke, he was led to resume the investigation; and in that year he completed a demonstration of the general theorem of an orbit described under the influence of a centripetal and tangential force, and the application of it to the case where

the force is inversely as the square of the distance, when it becomes an ellipse. It was not until 1684, when the subject had been much discussed in London, when Wren, Hooke, and Halley had severally made considerable advances towards a solution, and had even established the doctrine in regard to *circular* orbits, yet were unable to extend it to *elliptical*, that Halley took a journey (a thing of no small moment in those days) to Cambridge, to visit Newton, under a certain impression that he might be able to throw some light on the subject. To his great satisfaction he learned in conversation that Newton had obtained the solution, but had in his usual way so little valued it that he had dismissed the subject from his thoughts and lost the papers. When strongly urged by Halley, however, he promised to endeavour to recover the investigation; and, probably, with little effort was soon able to reproduce the whole, and even to carry it out to further consequences. He 'composed,' he says, 'about a dozen propositions,' which were sent to Halley; and a notice of the discovery was registered in the books of the Royal Society. Now fairly pledged to the investigation, during the remainder of that year, the whole of the next, and the beginning of 1686, he was intently engaged in seriously grappling with the great problem of universal gravitation, and working out the various details of the theory and its applications which crowded upon his mind as consequences from his grand principle. On April 28th the substance of what is now the first book of the '*Principia*' was communicated to the Royal Society. It was in due time followed by the remaining portions, and the whole published in June, 1687, by the spirited exertions and at the sole expense of Edmund Halley, then secretary to the Royal Society, without whose continued stimulus Newton would never have been induced to bring out his discoveries, and without whose singularly spirited pecuniary advances (at a time, too, when his own finances could hardly in prudence justify the risk,)—the world is indebted for the actual publication of this great work.

That a second edition of the *Principia* was wanted was clear in 1691. But the long-protracted discussions with Flamsteed which prevented the completion of the lunar theory, and Newton's subsequent avocations at the Mint, to say nothing of his own habitual reluctance to engage in any such undertaking, caused its postponement, till at length, in 1709, the importunities of Bentley, then Master of Trinity, prevailed with Newton to entrust the new edition to the care of that promising young mathematician Roger Cotes, then just appointed Plumian Professor of Astronomy and Experimental Philosophy.

The long correspondence between the editor and the author, preserved in the library of Trinity College, in which the progress of all the improvements in this edition is minutely traced, forms the substance of Mr. Edleston's valuable publication. The second edition was completed in June 1713: the third, under the care of Pemberton, appeared in 1726, the year before Newton's death. Sir D. Brewster's work is enriched by some valuable notes from the master-hand of Mr. Adams, of Cambridge, on the alterations introduced into the third edition. It is known that a long correspondence on this subject between Newton and Pemberton was in the possession of the descendants of the latter, but has never yet been discovered.

The *Principia* must on all hands be allowed to be a wonderful monument of genius, not only in regard to the actual discoveries and truths established in it, but by the manner and method in which they are worked out. It is, however, neither matter of surprise nor disparagement that those methods should have been improved upon, and generalised, in proportion as modern research has extended the details of the subject to which they were to be applied. Hence a comment on the text of the *Principia* exhibiting its demonstrations in comparison with the more recent processes, and indicating the parts of the theory where the most important extensions have been required and effected by the analytical investigations of the modern school, would be a work at once illustrative of both, and important alike to those who admiringly trace Newton's conceptions in the very form in which he originally delivered them, and to those who, taking the more enlarged views of Laplace and of his followers, wish still to follow their connexion with the more elementary developments of the theory as at first put forth. Such a work is supplied in the able analysis and commentary recently published by Lord Brougham and Mr. Routh, which places Newton's immortal work in a most convenient form within the reach of the modern student.

Even in the honours of this incontestible discovery, however, Newton was not at first allowed to repose in peace. For a time the invidious pretensions set up by Hooke led many to question his entire originality. But though such pretensions were soon set at rest, they were not without the effect of seriously disturbing his equanimity. In truth the peculiarities and even apparent contradictions of his character and constitutional tendencies are almost as great a marvel as his transcendent powers of intellect. We believe it may with the most perfect truth, without flattery or detraction, be said of him, *nemo unquam sic impar sibi*. The enjoyment of tranquil study — of

his crucibles and his calculations — seems to have been the one wish of his life: yet there were occasions on which we find him strangely stirred up from that apparent apathy to the world around him, and roused into strenuous exertion even at the imminent risk of sacrificing all the enjoyments he most prized.

In the very year of the publication of the '*Principia*' (1687), the illegal attempt of James II. to interfere with the rights of the University, called forth the memorable defence of those rights by a deputation of which Newton was not only a member, but the *one* member by whom a firm resistance against the encroachment was in the first instance offered, when others, especially the Vice-chancellor Pechel, were timid and temporising. It is not too much to say, that to his personal inflexibility and integrity the successful issue of the resistance was owing. Newton with his colleagues at the bar of the High Commission Court, opposing a calm but unassailable front to the arbitrary designs of that tribunal, and the infuriated insolence of the infamous Jeffreys, its president, — who, with the meanness characteristic of a cowardly bully, vented all his rancour on the timid and vacillating Vice-chancellor, deprived him of his offices and emoluments, yet was constrained to dismiss the deputation with an admonition 'to go and sin no more,' — must have been a spectacle little inferior in moral and intellectual grandeur to some others of that period which have afforded materials to our historical artists and artistic historian.

The principal events of Newton's life coincided in date with those of the most marked epochs in English history. But we shall not go into the state of public affairs at this crisis further than to mention, that Newton's zeal for the rights of the University, probably much more than his scientific fame, was the ground of his election to sit in the Convention Parliament for the University, as he did also in one subsequent parliament.

It is asserted by Sir D. Brewster, that during his residence in London to attend his public duties 'Newton was looking forward to some higher station in the University or some permanent appointment from the Government.' There was, in fact, no higher station in the University to which he could in the regular course of things aspire. But a vacancy in the mastership of King's College occurring in the same year, some of his powerful friends made a strange attempt to obtain it for him, which even succeeded so far as the issuing of a mandamus from the Crown (we know not how obtained), but which, if successful, would have been as arbitrary an act on

the part of William as any of the attempts of James had been. It, however, could not proceed, being manifestly in the teeth of the statutes of the college; of which it seems incredible that the parties could have been ignorant. In the next year, a somewhat similar effort was made to procure for him the Mastership of the Charterhouse, with respect to which he observed:—
 ‘I see nothing in the situation worth making a bustle for.
 ‘Besides a coach, which I consider not, ’tis but 200*l.* per annum,
 ‘with a confinement to the London air and to such a way of
 ‘living as I am not in love with; neither do I think it advisa-
 ‘ble to enter into such a competition as that would be for a
 ‘better place.’

His biographer seems to think that he blamed his friends for their backwardness to serve him; but in the face of such a declaration as this he must have been strangely inconsistent if he did. He does, indeed, express (in the same morbid disposition which betrays itself in some other instances) his suspicions of Mr. Montague not being true to him, and in consequence says, that ‘he had done with him; intending to sit still unless Lord Monmouth was still his friend.’ But when assured that Locke had interested both Lord and Lady Monmouth in his favour, he desires Locke to thank them equally ‘whether their design succeeded or not;’ and so far from pressing any interest he expressly says,—‘my inclinations are to sit still, and I intend not to give his lordship any further trouble.’ We can therefore in no way join in the opinion that Newton was unduly neglected. He had hardly yet attained general celebrity; several attempts had been made, without his approval, to obtain places for him; and he was already in the enjoyment of an honourable position in the University, the highest open to him, the widest sphere for the exercise of his talents, and of an income which was clearly ample for his moderate habits and wishes.

But while thus advancing in reputation, and in the midst of public duties, we are presented with a more touching trait of his personal character in his affectionate and assiduous attendance on his mother, who had been seized with a malignant fever. Braving all fears of infection, he nursed her day and night, and administered the remedies with his own hands. She, however, sunk under the disease, and was buried at Colsterworth.

Of all parts of the system of Gravitation, by far the most complex and difficult is the theory of the lunar inequalities. In the first research of Newton this intricate but most important portion of the inquiry was treated in a masterly

and general manner, yet leaving many material points still to be cleared up. After the publication of the first edition of the 'Principia' in 1687, therefore, this subject continued to occupy Newton's thoughts; and the more he pursued it the more sensible did he become at once of its difficulty and its importance to the completeness of the theory of gravitation. In 1692 he was more especially engaged in carrying out these investigations. Its intricacies put even his unparalleled powers to a severe trial. It caused him continual anxiety and incessant labour: nor can it be wondered at if it tried his patience and temper also; more especially when, in some parts of the subject, an additional supply of accurate observations was absolutely essential for putting the theory to the proof; and these were as yet wanting. They were to be supplied by the observations of Flamsteed at the Royal Observatory of Greenwich; but it was long before these were forthcoming; and a fresh source of trouble and vexation was opened in the discussions which arose as to their publication.

Many years afterwards, when Machin complimented Newton on his lunar theory, the latter replied, that 'his head had never ached but when he was studying that subject;' and Halley mentioned to Conduitt that he had often pressed Newton to complete that part of his theory, but he always replied, that 'it made his head ache, and kept him awake so often, that he would think of it no more.' He was harassed at once by the intricacies of the subject and his anxiety to possess more numerous and accurate observations of the moon's motions. But at a later period, when Halley was Astronomer Royal, Newton told Conduitt, that if he lived till Halley made six years' observations, 'he would have another stroke at the moon.' There can be no doubt that whatever may have been the real merits of the question between Newton and Flamsteed, the delays must have been a subject of intense disappointment to the former, and, doubtless, were alone sufficient to throw him into a state of mind not the most favourable for enduring any subsequent trials of temper, to which the discordant elements involved in their intercourse would subject him.

Thus we may take, as an exemplification of the state of his feelings, the following letter addressed to Flamsteed:—

Jermyn Street, Jan. 6. 1698-9.

SIR,—Upon hearing occasionally that you had sent a letter to Dr. Wallis about the parallax of the fixed stars, to be printed, and what you had mentioned therein with respect to the theory of the moon, I was concerned to be publicly brought on the stage, about what, perhaps, will never be fitted for the public, and thereby the

world put into an expectation of what, perhaps, they are never like to have. I do not love to be printed on every occasion; much less, to be dunned and teased by foreigners about mathematical things, or to be thought by our own people to be trifling away my time about them when I should be about the King's business. And, therefore, I desired Dr. Gregory to write to Dr. Wallis against printing that clause which related to that theory, and mentioned me about it. You may let the world know, if you please, how well you are stored with observations of all sorts, and what calculations you have made towards rectifying the heavenly motions. But there may be cases wherein your friends should not be published without their leave. And, therefore, I hope you will so order the matter that I may not, on this occasion, be brought upon the stage.

'I am your humble servant,

'IS. NEWTON.'

It will be in the recollection of all who are interested in these subjects that in 1835 the late eminent astronomer, Mr. F. Baily, published, from original documents, '*An Account of the Rev. John Flamsteed, first Astronomer Royal,*' &c.; which excited a high degree of interest, not only with regard to the scientific details, but especially as illustrative of the personal history and characters, of Flamsteed and of Newton; — disclosing for the first time the very serious nature of the misunderstanding which arose between them, and displaying, in a way not very creditable to either of them, the violence, and even virulence, of the quarrel. Nor will it be forgotten how keen was the controversy which the publication of these curious records occasioned at the time. The reflections made on the personal character and temper of Newton were regarded by many of his admirers as if they detracted from his philosophical preeminence; and those who in the ardour of hero-worship had invested him with almost superhuman perfections, could not endure to find that he was on some occasions liable to the common infirmities of our nature. Sir D. Brewster refers to this subject in a somewhat indignant tone, telling us that 'in 1835 the scientific world was startled by the publication of Baily's *Life of Flamsteed*, a huge volume deeply affecting the character of Newton; and, strange to say, printed and circulated throughout the world at the expense of the Board of Admiralty. The friends of the great philosopher were thus summoned to a painful controversy.* The Board of Admiralty, we imagine, had little to do with the merits of the controversy between Newton and Flamsteed. They exercised a wise liberality in bearing the expense of a publication the very name of whose editor was a guarantee

that it was worthy of their patronage, and which is on all hands admitted to throw material light on the history of British astronomy at one of its most important epochs. Sir D. Brewster has recalled attention to the subject with reference to some newly adduced documents as tending materially to elucidate the question, and, as he expresses it, 'to enable him 'to defend the illustrious subject of this work against a system 'of calumny and misrepresentation unexampled in the history 'of science.' But we think these expressions, as well as the entire tone in which our author takes up this question, are much stronger than the occasion really calls for. The examination of the recently discovered letters of Flamsteed as carried on by Sir D. Brewster, while it tends greatly to illustrate the entire history, yet does not, so far as we can judge, materially alter the impression as to the relations of the parties in the later proceedings; nor do we see that the actual peculiarities of Newton's disposition are in any remarkable degree softened by anything new here adduced. The conclusion we are inclined to adopt is, that the imperturbability of his temper was of that negative kind which arose from intense absorption within himself and insensibility to things around him: but any cause tending to disturb him from that state of tranquillity was resented, and made him irritable and suspicious. And to this, in the course of his discussions with Flamsteed, there were other predisposing causes arising out of his state of health which may account for a large portion of the infirmity of temper occasionally displayed: especially when he called Flamsteed 'many ill names; — "pappy" was the most innocent of them.'

It is not without some reference to the same questions that we may now advert to an incident on which a great deal more has been said than it deserves. On the statement of Mr. Conduitt after a conversation with Newton himself, we have the explicit account that he once accidentally left a candle on his table among some papers, by which they were burnt. Some of these related to optics and some to fluxions; and 'he was 'obliged to work them all over again.' The loss then was not serious, nor did it materially affect him. This we may take as the simple truth, and real basis of what has been dressed up in many fabulous forms and connected with other events with which it really had not the least relation. Dr. Stukely tells us that Newton wrote a piece of chemistry, 'explaining the principles of that mysterious art upon experimental and mathematical proof; and he valued it much; but it was unluckily burned in his laboratory which casually took

'fire. He would never undertake that work again: a loss much 'to be regretted.' Humphrey Newton alludes to a report existing of some such loss having been occasioned by fire, but says that if it occurred, it was before his time. Every one has heard that version of the story which compromises the rather apocryphal little dog 'Diamond'; while it is supposed to exhibit so beautiful a trait of the imperturbability of his master. Humphrey tells us that he 'kept neither dog nor cat in his 'chamber.' The story is in other respects embellished in the version of Mr. De la Pryme, in whose diary it is however entered only as what 'he has heard;' he bears no false witness against the dog; but describes the burning of the papers one winter morning while Newton was at chapel (where Humphrey says he never went), and affirms that he 'was 'so troubled thereat that everyone thought he would have run 'mad; he was not himself for a month after;' the papers having been, according to this account, researches on optics, on which immense sums had been spent, and twenty years' labour totally lost! And as a story never loses by repetition, Professor Sturm writes from Altorf, that a rumour had reached them that Newton's 'house and all his goods were burnt, and himself so 'disturbed in mind thereupon as to be reduced to very ill 'circumstances.'

Lastly, this incident has been connected with another, which many think still more apocryphal. The story of Newton's temporary derangement in 1692-3 was for the first time generally heard of by the English reading public in 1822, when M. Biot published his life, in which he professed to derive this fact from the explicit statement of a contemporary journal of Huyghens, then first brought to light; in which the incident is mentioned on the authority of one Colm, a Scotchman, who visited Huyghens soon after the alleged occurrence. The cause assigned was either 'too intense application to study, or excessive 'grief from having lost by fire his chemical laboratory and several 'manuscripts.' The burning of his papers, from what we have already observed, had no connexion whatever with any illness. But it is exceedingly probable that too intense application to study, and especially the anxieties attending the lunar theory, which 'made his head ache,' had a very close connexion with a state of ill health into which he had undoubtedly fallen during a part of 1692 and 1693. And that this illness was of a kind which lamentably shook his nerves, and to a certain extent interfered with the coherent exercise of his mental faculties appears to us placed beyond all doubt by the testimony of his own letters. That it is painful to witness so exalted a mind,

even for a time prostrated by the influence of bodily disorganisation, is no reason for shutting our eyes to facts, and thinking the credit of Newton at stake if we admit that he could ever have exhibited transient marks of incoherence or weakness.

The letters alluded to are not new to the reading public; but we must, in support of what we have said, briefly refer to them. The first is addressed to Pepys, dated September 13th, 1693:—

‘SIR,—Sometime after Mr. Millington had delivered your message he pressed me to see you the next time I went to London. I was averse, but, upon his pressing, consented, before I considered what I did; for I am extremely troubled at the embroilment I am in, and have neither ate nor slept well this twelvemonth, nor have my former consistency of mind. I never designed to get anything by your interest, nor by King James’s favour; but am now sensible that I must withdraw from your acquaintance, and see neither you nor the rest of my friends any more, if I may but leave them quietly. I beg your pardon for saying I would see you again; and rest

‘Your most humble and obedient servant,

‘IS. NEWTON.’

Pepys was naturally startled at such a letter, and immediately in much alarm wrote to their mutual friend Millington, who in answer says, that he has had an interview with Newton:—

‘He told me he had writt to you a very odd letter, at which he was much concerned; added that it was in a distemper that much seized his head, and that kept him awake for above five nights together; which, upon occasion, he desired I would represent to you, and beg your pardon; he being very much ashamed he should be so rude to a person for whom he hath so great an honour. He is now very well, and, though I fear he is under some small degree of melancholy, yet I think there is no reason to suspect it hath at all touched his understanding, and I hope never will.’

What he had said or done with reference to Locke seems still more extraordinary and inexplicable. Whatever it was, he not long after gave a most touching instance of contrition, coupled with a melancholy exposure of some of the aberrations into which he had been led with respect to his friend.

Thus he writes to Locke:—

‘Sept. 16. 1693.

‘SIR,—Being of opinion that you endeavoured to embroil me with women, and by other means, I was so much affected with it as that when one told me that you were sickly and would not live, I answered, “’twere better if you were dead.” I desire you to forgive

this uncharitableness, for I am now satisfied that what you have done is just, and I beg your pardon for my having had thoughts of you for it; and for representing that you struck at the root of morality, in a principle you laid in your book of ideas, and designed to pursue in another book, and that I took you for a Hobbist. I beg your pardon also for saying or thinking that there was a design to sell me an office, or to embroil me.

‘I am your most humble and unfortunate servant,

‘*Is. NEWTON.*’

Locke’s answer displays all the generous kindness and sympathy which might be expected from his excellent nature, and Newton again in his reply to Locke explains the cause of his apparent incoherency, and the delusion under which he laboured:—

‘*SIR*,—The last winter, by sleeping too often by my fire, I got an ill habit of sleeping; and a distemper, which this summer has been epidemical, put me further out of order; so that when I wrote to you, I had not slept an hour a night for a fortnight together, and for five days together not a wink. I remember I wrote to you, but what I said of your book I remember not. If you please to send me a transcript of that passage I will give you an account of it if I can.

‘I am your most humble servant,

‘*Is. NEWTON.*’

This indisputable evidence under Newton’s own hand, affords a striking illustration of what has been said in another part of this Number on the effect of interrupted sleep on the mental faculties.

M. Biot, on a subsequent occasion, has expressed his surprise at the sensitiveness of English philosophers at the allegation of Newton having suffered from such a malady; and in this we most entirely concur with him; more especially when we perceive the asperity of tone adopted by Sir D. Brewster (after quoting a passage from Biot) in reference to it, in observing that however great M. Biot’s surprise may have been, ‘it cannot be equal to that which they feel at his persisting in the statement and at the offensive aggravation of it which is contained in the preceding extract.’

M. Biot has viewed the whole subject of the quarrel with Flamsteed as connected with Newton’s supposed aberration of mind, which he regards as having been of much longer continuance, than the few months during which it is on all hands clear he was labouring under considerable derangement of bodily health, and perhaps in some measure of mental also. M. Biot, in fact, supposes the malady to have been to a certain extent permanent, as having at least so far affected Newton’s powers of thought as to render him incapable of any great efforts of investigation

after the period in question; and more particularly he sees in the irritation, and as he considers it the incoherence, of some of the letters to Flamsteed only a repetition of the same characteristics as those which so painfully mark the letters to Pepys and Loeke. He finds further confirmation of his idea in the circumstance of Newton's unaccountably reserved and taciturn conduct at a later period when giving evidence before a parliamentary committee on the subject of the proposed Board of Longitude; and believes that the effects of the attack are manifested in all his subsequent productions, especially his theological writings, which he conceives betray an enfeebled intellect.

We are fully persuaded that M. Biot has carried out this theory to a greater extent than the data will really bear. At the same time we admit that the morbid sensitiveness which was a prominent feature in Newton's original constitution may have been acted upon to so injurious an extent by bodily ill health and mental labour, as to leave him liable to nervous irritability of mind under peculiar exciting circumstances, such as those of his intercourse with Flamsteed, which gave rise to seeming incoherence in his expressions, and conjured up delusive suspicions and unfounded jealousies, to a degree which in a sound state of bodily health and under calmer auspices he would never have entertained.

To these sources of disquiet others were added in the violent controversy which arose out of the rival claims of Leibnitz to an invention similar to that of fluxions, which Newton had so long concealed. If Newton hoped for quiet by withholding his productions from the public, never was he more unfortunately deceived. The embroilment (to use his favourite expression) continued unabated through a considerable part of the later portion of his life.

Charles Montagu (grandson of the Earl of Manchester) had been acquainted with Newton at Cambridge, though much his junior: he sat with him in the Convention Parliament; and after having filled several official situations, he became in 1694 Chancellor of the Exchequer. The reformation of the coinage was at that juncture a most pressing object, as Mr. Macaulay has recently related in his brilliant account of the financial difficulties of William III. Montague was fully alive to its importance, and was anxious to secure Newton's valuable aid in reference to an object which involved scientific knowledge both mathematical and chemical.

Coming events cast their shadows before; and in some unaccountable way towards the end of 1695, a rumour prevailed

that Newton was appointed Master of the Mint. It was wholly untrue, as there was then no vacancy. Nevertheless it called forth from Newton the characteristic declaration, in a letter to Halley, 'if the rumour of preferment for me in the Mint should hereafter, upon the death of Mr. Hoare* or any other occasion, be revived, I pray that you would endeavour to obviate it, by acquainting your friends that I neither put in for any place in the Mint, nor would meddle with Mr. Heare's place were it offered me.'

In the following year, however, a vacancy did occur in the Wardenship of the Mint, and Montague, in a letter equally full of personal regard and the consciousness of putting the right man in the right place, announced to Newton his appointment to that office, then worth 600*l.* per annum. While on another occasion he declared that 'he would not suffer the lamp which gave so much light to want oil.'

Newton's services as Warden of the Mint† were so highly appreciated, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer declared he could not have carried on the new coinage without his assistance. It was not completed till the end of 1699; and Montague (soon after created Lord Halifax), now First Lord of the Treasury, on a vacancy in the Mastership of the Mint, conferred that high office on Newton; the most graceful tribute which the Government could pay to that transcendent genius which had shed lustre on his country in the eyes of all Europe. So high had his reputation become on the Continent, that it was said the French King had offered him a large pension, which he declined: but he was created one of the eight foreign associates of the Academy of Sciences on the reorganisation of that body in the same year. The duties of his office required residence in London. But Newton still held the Lucasian chair, and might occasionally lecture to bare walls: the latter interesting duty, however, he now resigned into the hands of the celebrated W. Whiston as his deputy, with the full profits of the place. In 1701, however, he formally resigned the professorship, and earnestly promoted the appointment of Whiston as his successor. In the same year also he resigned his fellowship.

There is some difficulty in tracing Newton's first habitation in London. Towards the close of 1697 he occupied a house in

* Then Comptroller of the Mint.

† Those who wish to form an accurate estimate of the actual amount of Newton's services in this great work must refer to a most elaborate paper by Professor De Morgan, in the Companion to the British Almanac, 1856.

Jermyn Street, near St. James's Church. Thence in October, 1709, he temporarily removed to a part of Chelsea 'near the College,' and in September, 1710, he finally took up his abode in Martin Street, Leicester Square, in a house now a printing office at the corner of Long's Court. There he remained till 1725, two years before his death, when he removed to Kensington for better air, to a spot then called Orbell's, but more lately, Pitt's Buildings, where he died.

When settled in the metropolis he adopted a style of living suited to his position, and freely received at his house the numerous visitors, native and foreign, who were attracted by his celebrity and who appreciated his merits. But in this mode of life he received the most material aid from another source.

Newton's half sister, Hannah Smith, married Robert Barton, of Brigstock, in Northamptonshire. We know nothing of the issue of this marriage except as regards one daughter, Catherine, born in 1679, and who was consequently only in her sixteenth year when Newton received his first appointment to the Mint. Newton commenced residence in London (as we have seen) in 1697. At some period after this — how soon precisely we are not informed — he received his poor but beautiful niece into his house, and invested her with the entire superintendence of his domestic affairs. It is hardly probable that this arrangement could have commenced till she was a little more advanced in age. It is, however, just possible that it occurred before Newton's promotion to the higher office in 1699; and on this last supposition it is also possible that Lord Halifax may have then seen her. If he did see her, he no doubt may have then been as much fascinated by her beauty as he certainly was at a later period. But granting all these suppositions, it certainly is not likely or credible, that Newton should have owed his second, much less his first, appointment to the influence of her charms on the minister. There is, therefore, great improbability, if not a positive anachronism in Voltaire's satire, that Newton, instead of being raised to preferment from his acknowledged merits, owed it entirely to the charms of his niece, and the admiration with which she had inspired Halifax. Yet this story, and others more absurd, have been currently circulated respecting her.

Sir D. Brewster states that Newton had educated her; one of the many proofs he gave of his generosity towards those of his connexions who were in any way in need of it; though he perhaps took this step with the additional motive of intending to make her his housekeeper; and that nothing might be wanting to complete the arrangement in every way for her comfort

and future benefit, in 1706 he settled upon her an annuity of 200*l.*, of which his friend Lord Halifax was made a trustee. Such at least is Sir D. Brewster's view of the arrangement. She fully repaid his kindness, and amply fulfilled the requisitions of presiding over his household and his table. Whether or not she had entered on her housekeeping duties before 1700, it is certain that in that year she was residing near Woodstock; and there had an attack of the small-pox. But in a letter addressed to her by 'her very loving uncle,' he 'hopes that the remains of it are dropping off apace.' Wishes 'to know by the next how your face is, and if the fever 'be going; perhaps warm milk from the cow may help to 'abate it.'

The effects of this malady were however, in her case, not such as permanently to impair her beauty, which we suspect was of a kind less dependent on mere features and complexion, than on the higher and more enduring graces of person, manner, and intelligence. Catherine Barton was clearly a very extraordinary woman. We know no particulars of her education, and we cannot suppose it to have been above the average of those days. She must, however, have profited by it in no ordinary degree, aided by native talent of a peculiar and many-sided kind; since we no sooner find her presiding at her uncle's parties than men of all grades and pursuits were fascinated as much by her talent and conversation as by her personal charms. She could converse equally well with philosophers and politicians, with men of the world and retired students; she could flirt with the gay, and argue with the grave; she could talk fashionable scandal with Lady Betty Germaine, politics with Swift, and science with Brook Taylor, Dr. Moivre, and Montmort.

Writing in the heat of the fluxionary controversy, Brook Taylor cannot omit wishing to 'make his most humble services 'acceptable to Mrs. Barton;' and Montmort, on his return to France, bears testimony to her fascinations in no measured terms, in a letter to B. Taylor, accompanying a present of fifty bottles of champagne to Newton, with respect to which he declares:—

'Ce seroit dommage que ce bon vin fut bu par des commis
'de vos douanes, étant destiné pour des bouches philosophiques
'et la belle bouche de Mademoiselle Barton. Je suis infiniment
'sensible de l'honneur qu'elle me fait de se souvenir de moy.
'J'ai conservé l'idée du monde la plus magnifique de son esprit
'et de sa beauté'. . . . and this more especially on account
of 'l'air le plus spirituel et le plus fin,' which characterises her.

In a poem of the day, entitled 'The Toasters,' when all the

reigning beauties receive their appropriate recognitions in distinct epigrams, the name of Barton is celebrated with due honour both for wit and beauty.

In 1710, Swift's journal contains a series of entries of his repeated visits to Mrs. Catherine Barton which evince the admiration she inspired. He seems to have prided himself on dining with her alone more than once; yet he complains that 'he loves her better than any one here, and sees her seldomer.' He gives up his usual society, and changes his manner of living; for the sake of getting into her company, he moved his lodgings to be nearer to hers. On one occasion, 'we were three hours together disputing upon Whig and Tory.' On another, 'I have been so teased with Whiggish discourse by Mrs. Barton and Lady Betty Germaine, — never saw the like.' At a much later date, a letter from her to Swift is of itself a model of its kind.

Among others who frequented Newton's house, Lord Halifax could not resist the effect of her charms, though probably long after the period imagined by Voltaire. Of the precise extent of his admiration nothing is recorded. But in his will he left her all his jewels, 5000*l.*, with a grant from the Crown, during her life, of the Rangership and Lodge of Bushy Park, and the manor of Apscourt: 'These gifts and legacies,' he adds, 'I leave her as a token of the sincere love, affection, and esteem, I have long had for her person, and as a small recompense for the pleasure and happiness I have had in her conversation.' He also charges his executor to 'transfer to her an annuity of 200*l.* purchased in Sir I. Newton's name, and which he (Halifax) held in trust for her.' He died in 1715.

In an anonymous life of Lord Halifax, evidently a trumpery work, got up by the disreputable publisher Curll, and which Sir D. Brewster has traced to an unknown penny-a-liner, one Pittis, the following passage occurs, when he is speaking of the death of Lord Halifax's lady: —

'Upon whose decease his lordship took a resolution of living single thenceforward, and cast his eye upon the widow of one Col. Barton, and niece to the famous Sir Isaac Newton, to be superintendent of his domestic affairs. But as this lady was young, beautiful, and gay, so those who were given to censure passed a judgment upon her which she no way merited, since she was a woman of strict honour and virtue; and though she might be agreeable to his lordship in every particular, that noble peer's complaisance to her proceeded wholly from the great esteem he had for her wit and most exquisite understanding, as will appear from what relates to her in the will at the close of these memoirs.'

Passing over the trivial mistake as to her widowhood, that a person in Mrs. Catherine's situation should not have escaped calumny, is no way surprising; but that such insinuations should be conceived to be in any way supported by the above statement, which, so far as it is worth anything, goes directly to contradict them, may well be a matter of astonishment. One circumstance, however, may require a word: Halifax, in his will (as we have seen), charges his executor 'to transfer 'to her the annuity purchased in Sir I. Newton's name.' This has been supposed to bear an ambiguous meaning. We do not profess to comprehend the exact nature of the transaction from these words, unless it were, as Sir D. Brewster supposes, simply an annuity purchased for her life by her uncle, and of which Halifax was trustee. If it mean that Halifax purchased the annuity, why did he do it in Sir I. Newton's name? or how could it be transferred to Miss Barton? his name was not concealed in the matter, since he was at any rate avowedly a trustee. However this may be, supposing Halifax to have been the donor, it was clearly a legitimate mode of substantially evincing his friendship for the uncle and his admiration for the niece, by making a provision for her after her uncle's death, when she would probably much need it. To infer from it anything in the way of an underhand payment, in requital for favours of a more particular nature (as has been insinuated) is not only wholly unsupported by evidence, nor even probability, but clearly inconceivable when we recollect that Newton was himself a party to the transaction; a man whose precise morality would not endure an approach to impropriety; — who even cut his old acquaintance Viganì for once 'telling a loose story about a nun;' — yet he continued to retain his niece as the head of his household during the whole period in which any such proceedings, if they existed, must have been going on. Moreover, in August, 1717, she was married to John Conduitt, Esquire, of Cranbury, in Hampshire; a man of position and character, not likely to marry the cast-off mistress of a premier; and for four years after their marriage they continued to reside in Newton's house. Conduitt latterly assisted in the duties of the Mint, and, doubtless from consideration to Newton's high opinion of him, was appointed his successor in the office. Their only daughter married the Hon. John Wallop, afterwards Viscount Lymington, through whom the Earls of Portsmouth are descended from Catharine Barton, and many valuable memorials of Newton have been preserved in their family.

Mr. Conduitt, describing Newton's personal appearance in

the latter part of his life, says, he had a 'comely and gracious aspect,' and 'a very lively and piercing eye.' Bishop Atterbury, however, thought, that 'in the whole air of his face and make there was nothing of that penetrating sagacity which appears in his compositions: he had something rather languid in his look and manner, which did not raise any great expectation in those who did not know him;' which is confirmed by the testimony of Hearne, the antiquary, who says, 'he was a man of no very promising aspect.' . . . 'He spoke little in company; so that his conversation was not agreeable. When he rode in his coach, one arm would be out of his coach on one side and the other on the other.' But this last peculiarity is strangely interpreted by Arago (in his *éloge* of Young), who ascribes it to timidity and the continual fear of being upset.

When his admiring friend Locke stated confidentially to the Lord Chancellor King that Newton 'is a nice man to deal with and a little too apt to raise in himself suspicions where there is no ground,' we cannot be surprised that Flamsteed should have declared that he found Newton 'insidious, ambitious, and excessively covetous of praise, and impatient of contradiction.' D'Alembert observes: 'In England people were content with Newton's being the greatest genius of the age: in France one would also have wished him to be amiable;' and no doubt it would have been desirable to have been able to assign to him both kinds of excellence; but we must be content with him as we find him.

The numerous instances of his pecuniary liberality to his relations and others who stood in need of it, are not fairly to be disparaged by the fact that he was notoriously careless of money; of which several curious instances are on record. He had once been imposed upon in the purchase of an estate, and when told that he might vacate the bargain in equity, he replied, 'that he would not for the sake of 2000*l.* go into Westminster Hall to tell that he had been made a fool of.'

He one day missed bank bills to the amount of 3000*l.*, and suspected that his pocket had been picked by the graceless nephew of his friend Whiston, who had bought an estate at that price without any ostensible means of paying for it. Yet he could not be prevailed on to prosecute; and when Conduitt asked him how much he had lost, he only answered 'too much.'

When he was attended by the eminent surgeon Cheselden, he took out of his coat pocket a handful of guineas and offered them as a fee, and on Cheselden's remonstrating, he only said

laughing, 'suppose I do give you more than your fee.' Being told that Dr. Cheyne had written an ingenious book on mathematics, but had not money to print it, Newton offered him a bag of money which he refused, and 'Newton would see him 'no more.'

Anxious as Newton was above all things for quiet and tranquillity, he seems to have been destined never to enjoy it. No sooner was he appointed to the Mint than he was harassed by a series of annoyances arising from the misconduct and quarrels of his subordinates, and was even himself the subject of accusations and calumnies, which were however promptly repressed and silenced by his elevation to the Mastership. On his assuming the chair of the Royal Society, even that philosophical body was not exempt from dissensions of a very undignified and disgraceful character, which led to some serious and unseemly altercations at a public meeting of the society, when, after a violent attack upon him from Dr. Woodward, Dr. (afterwards Sir Hans) Sloane (according to the friends of the former) 'made grimaces,' and Sir Isaac called him 'a tricking fellow,' and 'a villain, and a rascal!'

The surreptitious publication of his *Chronology* was not un-mixed with other annoyances (or at least was connected with them in Newton's too susceptible and suspicious apprehensions), as is painfully evinced in the following expressions:—

'Abbé Conti came into England in spring, 1715, and while he staid in England he pretended to be my friend, but assisted Mr. Leibnitz in engaging me in new disputes. The part he acted here may be understood by the character given of him in the *Acta Eruditorum* for 1721. . . . And how Mr. Leibnitz, by his mediation, endeavoured to engage me, against my will, in new disputes about occult qualities, universal gravity, the sensorium of God, space, time, vacuum, atoms, the perfection of the world, supra-mundane intelligence, and mathematical problems, is mentioned in the second edition of the "*Commercium Epistolicum*." And what he hath been doing in Italy may be understood by the disputes raised there by one of his friends, who denies many of my optical experiments, though they have been all tried in France with success. But I hope that these things and the perpetual motion will be the last efforts of this kind, —will be the last efforts of those friends of Mr. Leibnitz to embroil me.' (Vol. ii. p. 306.)

We have gone to too great length in the details of Newton's personal history and private life to allow room for, or perhaps to require, extended general remarks. As to the extraordinary peculiarities of his idiosyncrasy, our readers will be able to judge for themselves. Extremes of praise or blame are for the most part equally erroneous. While we do not uphold him as

a model of moral as well as of intellectual excellence, we can by no means assent to the assertion that he was destitute of common good feelings. We cannot agree in a parallel which has been drawn between him and Bacon as similar instances of transcendent intellectual greatness combined with the lowest moral meanness. We cannot admit, as has been said by a recent critic, that his was 'iron intellect surrounding a moral vacuum.' We do not believe, on the other hand, that he was all goodness, beneficence, and patience. He was imperturbable when there was nothing to perturb him; but once thrown off his equilibrium he had little self-control, and became often irritable, sometimes intemperate. But he could be also generous, forgiving, and courageous, as he was always transparently honest and incorruptibly pure. The truth is, that the intellect which had most deeply sounded and explored the mysteries of external nature was at times perplexed and obscured by the mysteries and infirmities of its own constitution, and in embracing the system of the universe Newton at times lost possession of himself.

We have not gone into particular literary criticism of Sir D. Brewster's work. But our readers will see how far we have found reason to differ from the author in some points, while we freely admit that the literary and scientific world is deeply indebted to him for the disclosure of a large amount of new information relating to the illustrious subject of this memoir. But amid many highly rhetorical passages, and copious scientific illustrations of the history of Newton's discoveries, there is to our mind something of a one-sided and disagreeable tone pervading the whole performance; and as a composition we hardly think the work a memorial altogether worthy either of Newton or of Brewster.

- ART. VII. — 1. *Modern Painters*. By JOHN RUSKIN. Vol. I., containing Parts 1 and 2. Fifth Edition, revised. 1851. Vol. II., containing Part 3. Sections 1 and 2. Third Edition, revised. 1851. Vol. III., containing Part 4. 1856.
2. *Pre-Raphaelitism*. 1851.
3. *Notes on some of the Principal Pictures Exhibited in the Rooms of the Royal Academy*. By JOHN RUSKIN. Third Edition. 1855.
4. *Giotto and his Works in Padua*. Part 1. (Printed for the Arundel Society.) 1854.

IT has been noted by physicians that such epidemics as plague, or falling sickness, or nervous distemperature, on every new recurrence, seize hold of some class of susceptible persons not attacked by them when disease last made its round; but, during one visitation the malady will be more fatal than during another, by reason of this very change in the victims of the infection. The remark holds good if applied to literature. Convulsions there must be, so long as the Poet's imagination is liable to disorders, — so long as the Professor's brain is accessible to vanity. But when the convulsionary spirit passes from those who create to those who teach, the malady assumes its most malignant form, and engenders evils which it may take a century to eradicate. A 'Werter,' a 'Nouvelle Héloïse,' or any other morbid romance, does its immediate work of harm by exciting the passions; but its influence may at any moment be superseded by some such simple and healthy writer as Scott — more able than Goethe or Rousseau to enthral millions, without quickening a single unwholesome appetite. Longer-lived may be the influence of the pulpit, when fanaticism by way of faith, and dogmatism in place of research, are recommended by theatrical gestures and declamatory periods. False taste in poetry or in art is bad; but false deduction in history and false doctrine in criticism, are the worst of all. So far as Painting is concerned, we seem to be passing through such a period of false and superficial pedantry under the disguise of superior attainments and infallible authority. The right of imagination to confound terms and of self-will to fling out new definitions has been asserted with a rhapsodical fluency which has taken modest persons by storm. They have been stunned into submission while the teacher of principles has maintained that a series of contradictory paradoxes comprised the one saving consistency which is to regenerate Art. They have been

hidden to prove their humility by a total surrender of the functions of memory. But the frenzy has reached—possibly has passed—its crisis; and Mr. Ruskin must forgive us if we deal with his vaticinations as if they were amenable to the laws of common sense, and proceed to examine some of his claims to be a master in Israel.

This third volume of 'Modern Painters,' if viewed in context with its writer's former works, shows the extent to which excessive pretensions and imperfect acquirements have bewildered and corrupted a mind rich in ingenious knowledge of detail, and gifted with rhetorical powers which ought, if better guided, to have done service to the study and the philosophy of Art. If we examine how far, in Mr. Ruskin's writings, desire for display has superseded the love of truth, the task is entered on, not because it is agreeable, but because it is seasonable. After having made a fame, by hanging on to the skirts of a famous artist—after deluding those craving for novelty into the belief that a dashing style must imply precious discoveries—after having met the humour of the time, by preaching the religion of architecture with a freedom in the use of sacred names and sacred things from which a more reverential man would have shrunk—after having served as an eloquent though too flattering guide to the treasures of Venice,—after having enriched the citizens of this Scottish metropolis with receipts how to amend the architecture of our city by patching Palladian squares, streets, and crescents with Gothic windows, balconies, and pinnacles,—after having lectured to decorators on the beauty and virtue of painting illegible letters on sign-boards and shop-fronts,—the wisdom of Mr. Ruskin has of late begun to cry in the streets. He attempts to erect the most extravagant paradoxes into new canons of taste; and the virulence of his personalities is only exceeded by the eccentricity of his judgment. He now periodically enters the exhibition-room as an overseer, summoning gallery-loungers to stand and deliver their sympathies,—calling on bad painters to tremble,—and assailing those whom he dislikes with menaces and insults. Thus in the third edition of his Royal Academy *vade mecum* for 1855, after having referred to a former vituperation of a picture by Mr. Roberts,—

'I have great personal regard for Mr. Roberts,' says our Oracle, 'but it may be well to state at once, that whenever I blame a painting, I do so as gently as is consistent with just explanation of its *principal* defects. I never say half of what I could say in its disfavour; and it will hereafter be found, that when once I have felt it my duty to attack a picture, the worst policy which the friends of

the artist can possibly adopt will be to defend it.' (*Notes*, 3rd ed. p. 36.)*

Absurd and impertinent as this language is, especially when addressed to artists who do not owe their fame to Mr. Ruskin's favour, it is worth while to inquire what right he has to use it. It may be conceded that few English writers have devoted themselves to the literature of Art, who have been more richly gifted by nature than Mr. Ruskin. He has that warmth of admiration which is eminently quickening to the spirits of colder pilgrims; he has that brightness of imagination which enables him to seize what is subtle in intention, and to comprehend what is noble in design. He commands an expressive style — fluent, versatile, and sonorous in no common degree. He can allow for the varying relations which exist betwixt art and society. Mr. Ruskin, too, has wrought industriously, travelled far, seen much, collected largely. These are precious attributes and qualifications; yet rarely has the value of such gifts been more completely neutralised than in the case of the author of 'Modern Painters.' Rarely has vanity, so overweening in stature, so unblushing in front, so magisterial in language, risen up between a writer and his public. That the praise of others has encouraged this tone proves the weakness of the apostle, as much as the credulity of his auditory. There is much of folly and of fashion in all similar epidemics of admiration; but there is something, also, more generous than mere folly. The persons of quality who swooned and fainted on the pulpit-stair at Hatton Garden while Irving held forth during what Dr. Chalmers called 'his exhausting services,' must not bear the whole blame of Irving's aberrations and eccentricities. There lurked in the preacher's mind—there must lurk in the minds of all belonging to the school to which he belonged, and to which Mr. Ruskin belongs, including Poets, Critics, or Social Reformers—a morbid avidity for immediate effect, for immediate recognition, for immediate adulation, which becomes absolutely poisonous,—and poisonous to none more than to the Professors or Preachers themselves, since it destroys in them not only the will, but even the power of being truthful.

* Mr. Roberts and Mr. Maclise are, it seems, the peculiar objects of Mr. Ruskin's aversion; and he is said to have addressed to these gentlemen a formal sentence of his supreme disapprobation. Yet in the first volume of 'Modern Painters,' p. 116., we read, 'Works of David Roberts, *their fidelity and grace*;' and Maclise is certainly the artist in the whole Royal Academy who has carried to its highest pitch that finish which Mr. Ruskin admires in the Pre-Raphaelite school.

It is necessary—to avoid the imputation of unjust severity—to recapitulate some facts of our author's past career. Mr. Ruskin, after having made himself favourably known as 'a writer of fugitive verse, was tempted into his first emission of prose in the hope, he says, 'of compelling the English public 'to do honour to an English painter of genius,' who had not received his just dues. There may be generosity in such a case of officious advocacy, if the advocate does not, by way of advertising his own tropes and metaphors, take up a cause which stands in no need of it. But, strange as it may seem to Mr. Ruskin, Turner had his English appreciators and his English public previous to the year 1846. There were persons who delighted not in Turner's oil paintings only, but in his drawings, which our author eulogises with such commendable warmth. There were already such connoisseurs as Lord Egremont, Mr. Fawkes, and Mr. Munro, eager to appropriate the best specimens of that painter's varied and original genius. There was already a circle of enthusiasts prompt to form itself round every new specimen of Turner's extraordinary powers, and even to palliate the freaks and aberrations of his prismatic brush. It was not as a discoverer, but as a representative of the tastes and wishes of these partisans, we imagine, that Mr. Ruskin began to harangue. But the teacher on such subjects could only collect crowds by the singularity of his own contortions,—by the daring vehemence of his paradoxes,—and by the abuse of all pilgrims who, either from old faith or new conviction, bowed at any other altar. Accordingly, the landscape-painters, from whom Turner had derived many of his models, and learned many of his secrets—the Vanderveldes, Salvators, and Claudes—were branded by Mr. Ruskin as idiots, ruffians, liars; and the preacher snatching up Truth and Nature as his watchwords, but forgetting that these also imply Love, Charity, and Reverence, rushed into the arena—Malay fashion—thrusting here, sniting there, foaming at the mouth, to establish his professional sanctity; yet resting adroitly, by fits and starts, to utter some old truth that sounded like a new revelation, or to relieve himself after his bursts of rant by some outpouring of genuine poetry. Gorgeous and delicious descriptions of Nature, high-flown appeals to conscience, religious faith and duty (as though these had been standards not dreamed of by any modern save our author), seduced some readers,—awed others. The timid held their breath; the imaginative were warmed; the thoughtful deferred pronouncing sentence on the doctrines of one claiming so high a mission, so new an inspiration. Meanwhile Turner continued to paint away, more puzzled than pleased, it is said, by

the antics of his adorer; whether to paint more wisely or more wildly as age came on, we will not here inquire. It does not come within our province to examine one by one the claims advanced by Mr. Ruskin for Turner, as compared with other landscape artists, on the strength of which he has awarded to that painter a pedestal by the side of our Bacons and Shakespeares — the highest minds and the most versatile and vigorous poets — of England. But one remark must be offered. Completeness is necessary to a work of art, though indication justifies a man in styling himself an artist. By completeness we do not mean subscription to certain forms of arrangement, to certain niceties of finish: but we cannot count as a picture the work which has been considered by its painter as a field for experiment, and thrown aside when that experiment had been tested. It matters little whether the experiment be that made by a Reynolds, when he painted with liquor from a South Sea shell in the hope of finding something like the *murex* of the Tyrians, to obtain a new flesh tint; or whether it be the attempt of a Turner to fix on his canvas those evanescent atmospheric effects which defy all attempts to perpetuate them, as invincibly as the voice of a mountain echo defies the best skilled musician — or as the breath of rose and orange flowers which greets the traveller through the dusk of a summer night as he drops down on the Lake of Como eludes the art of the most magical chemist. To experiment there is no limit; to art there are many limits placed by circumstance, by finite mortal power. By the labours of the experimentalists are won extensions of these limits, few and far between, enlargements of the boundaries established by the schools of past ages. Yet the most courageous experimentalists, though they may be among the greatest poets, are not after all the greatest artists. They are too bold, too breathless: they are, after a time, too willing to devote themselves to experiment for experiment's sake. They are too apt to count upon the appreciating power of those whom they have trained up step by step to relish a manner, and to neglect that juster and less mannered section of the public which arrives direct at a real work of art, and cares little for that which can be only rightly enjoyed from some prescribed point of view, or after a recondite explanation of the painter's intentions. In the pursuit of novelty they lose that simplicity which is the purest gift of the artist and the highest merit of art. Some such want of clearness, some such inefficiency of execution wholly to bear out the intention, are all chargeable against Turner, by those who have not penetrated the peculiar qualities of his style and educated themselves to ad-

mire it. But intolerance or indifference on the part of the English public, in regard to his great genius, there has been none. Our collectors, our gallery haunters, have not ignored the previous existence of practical or poetical landscape art, in order to glorify the discoveries or the vagaries of one given man; but the English world of connoisseurs was not 'blinded to the presence of a great spirit among them till the hour of its departure' (which Mr. Ruskin declares to be historical fact). Mr. Turner not only lived to see his fame rise above vulgar criticism, but in the course of a long life he realised a large fortune by his works. There was no cruel neglect of Turner before Mr. Ruskin rose to protect him; there was much toleration for his visions and eccentricities. This was extended to him long before Turner had a champion; and although Turner may owe something to so fervent a disciple as Mr. Ruskin, Mr. Ruskin owes a great deal more to the celebrity he has contrived to borrow from so great an artist as Turner.

After this fashion has been the progress of Mr. Ruskin as a writer on Art. His next device was to transfer to the newest eccentricity of the day — that of what are called the Pre-Raphaelites — the devotion he had hitherto paid to a Painter who was not only their superior but their opposite. But the real direction and consequence of such efforts cannot be forever disguised by the most adroit master of rhapsody, let him be ever so able to amuse his readers, and to keep them from thinking. When the excitement of novelty has subsided, even the most stupid of those who have been commanded to believe will find a spirit of inquiry stir, and the faculties of comparison awaken. And thus students of Painting will not, because it is Mr. Ruskin's pleasure, receive Turner's scenic effects, and the finish of the Pre-Raphaelites as the growth of the same tree, as illustrations of the same system. They will not consent to denounce all Greek architecture as base, disgusting, utterly to be scouted from earth, with all its dependencies and descendants, when they recollect that it was on Greek forms that the mediæval builders based their edifices, and from Greek fragments and materials that they drew their first examples of decoration. They will ask how far it is just that a censor, who in some cases adduces every exception as an example, every blemish as a beauty, and every irregularity as a sign of enterprise, in others shall denounce the smallest deficiencies as damnable of those who exhibit them. — They may inquire, for instance, how an arbiter of taste, who finds the festoon and garland decorations of the Palladian architecture abominable because they are not natural, can delight in the pillars supporting

porches and resting on the backs of couchant animals, which flank so many a mediæval door-way. Nor will honest persons rest till they have endeavoured to ascertain how far all these contradictory prejudices can be reconciled; how far they are based on a burning desire to surprise and to overrule—how far on the love of Truth—how far on the knowledge of it. We have no doubt as to the result of such inquiries. The strange assumption and inaccuracy of Mr. Ruskin as an oracle of Art will become clearly evident even to those who recognise his industry in collecting detail, his ingenuity in finding a reason for everything that it suits his whim to invent, and the poetry of language with which he embellishes what he attempts to describe.

But all who desire to be taught have a right to claim from those who profess to teach them, besides the name of Truth, something of its nature—truth in research—truth in definition—truth in reasoning—truth in interpretation. That these things go far to make up truth in belief, few of those who are the most profoundly impressed with mortal fallibility will dispute. Hence, in proportion as the cry of Truth is raised by the empiric to justify paradox, to excuse license, to accredit insolence, in so much is the wrong done cruel. But the offence is common, and profitable. The most unscrupulous persons are the noisiest in assuring mankind of their scrupulosity. Who are so hypocritical as those whose lips overflow with the profession of sincerity? Who are so inexact as the dogmatists, who *not* having satisfied themselves by warrantable means, choose that no subsequent inquirer shall be able to ascertain on what *data* they rest their conclusions? No one has ever exposed his claims to truthfulness to a sterner examination than Mr. Ruskin; since rarely has the serviceable cry been raised more loudly than by him, whether to authenticate the examples he has collected, to recommend the principles he expounds, or to praise the artists whom he delights to honour. — ‘He will not’ (he says) ‘put forth an example of Raphael’s tree-work without having copied the trees leaf for leaf.’* He will not defend the irregularities on the *façade* of Pisa Cathedral, without having precisely counted the arches in each arcade. He does not specify merely the coloured marbles which harmoniously encrust a Murano archivolt, but he calls attention to the very spots in some of the fragments. The speciousness of such professed accuracy is calculated to inspire confidence and to discourage all counter-examination.

* Modern Painters, vol. iii. p. 320.

Yet those who rely on Mr. Ruskin's precision of detail will receive severe shocks when they come to test it precisely. We have ourselves detected more than one gross misrepresentation in the recondite and remote examples which he is much given to quote. If any one, for example, examine, with these 'Lectures' in hand, the bracket from the front of Lyons Cathedral, engraved (Plate IX., fig. 15.) for the Edinburgh 'Discourses on Architecture and Painting,' and there elaborately descanted on, he will find that the lecturer sketched that quaint morsel of stone-work through a glass as delusive as the veriest lilac or orange pane which bears the name of Mr. Ruskin's peculiar aversion—Claude Lorraine. Or, again, let the student of architectural detail search in the portal of Bourges Cathedral for the hawthorn-wreath more than once referred to by Mr. Ruskin as a lovely specimen of rural realism applied to the purposes of devotional art. He may search long before he finds what stands to Mr. Ruskin for hawthorn;—and will turn away from his discovery when he has made it, astounded at the imagination of the writer who has wrought up an example so unimportant and so questionable into a type of disproportionate value and beauty. Or (to offer a last example) let him take Mr. Ruskin's rapturous exposition of the Mosaic olive-tree (*vide* 'Stones of Venice,' vol. ii. p. 178.), and compare it with the lecturer's contemptuous mention of such Greek patterns as represent the wave of the sea, the flowers of the honeysuckle, or the leaves of the acanthus. We are satisfied that the stilted exaggeration of such praise, and the injustice of such blame, will strike the student as among the artifices of partisanship, which amount, in every sense of the word, to *partial* abandonment of veracity and a total want of candour.

We could work out these comparisons much further in following Mr. Ruskin as a collector of examples, most perversely swayed by sympathy and antipathy, did we purpose to do more than to invite those who put implicit faith in his accuracy, to test for themselves whether these things be true. But let us turn from example to precept. If Mr. Ruskin's assumptions and deductions, as set down in his third volume of 'Modern Painters,' be studied attentively, if we read his apologetic defence of Giotto's carelessness in landscape in the *brochure* issued by the Arundel Society, it will be seen, that he has used the pen not merely to flatter the eye in a favourite outline—not merely to entice the student to excuse that which was by circumstance barbarous, as if it were by purpose reverential—but also to frame definitions, which may be adroitly turned to any purpose. The following *dicta* (so far

as we comprehend them) are sound in themselves, but fallacious to a point of hypocrisy if by their aid we try Mr. Ruskin's criticism on the sinners whose pictures it suits him to blacken, in order that he may burnish the reputation of those whom he has chosen for his saints. Speaking of Giotto :—

‘When we know a little more of art in general,’ says Mr. Ruskin, ‘we shall begin to suspect that a man of Giotto's power of mind, did not altogether suppose his clusters of formal trees, or diminutive masses of architecture, to be perfect representations of the woods of Judea, or of the streets of Jerusalem; we shall begin to understand that there is a symbolical art which addresses the imagination as well as a realist art which supersedes it.’ (*Giotto and his Works in Padua*, p. 38.)

Now surely, this liberal saying might be brought to bear on the works of more professed landscape artists than Giotto, by any one really possessing the catholic spirit of toleration. Had Mr. Ruskin allowed it to guide him among Salvator Rosa's rocky coasts and gloomy wildernesses—to cast the light of its charity on Claude's Arcadian compositions,—he would not have been so rancorous in abuse of the banditti painter, so lofty in contempt of the artist who (we are quoting Mr. Ruskin again) first set the sun in heaven—pictorially.

Here is a second passage concerning truth in Art, by aid of which anything may be rejected, or everything accepted, according as the truth-lover is in a critical or credulous humour.

‘There are some truths,’ says Mr. Ruskin, ‘easily obtained, which give a deceptive resemblance to nature: others, only to be obtained with difficulty, which cause no deception, but give inner and deep resemblance.’ (*Modern Painters*, vol. iii. p. 131.)

The convenience of this theory of inner and deep resemblance need scarcely be pointed out, since it invests the seer with full power to pierce where others cannot enter,—to decide where simpler observers doubt,—to assume or lay aside authority in proportion as his tendencies are peaceful or warlike.

Many more such elastic definitions of truth will be found under the section ‘Sincerity,’ in the chapter ‘On the real Nature of Greatness of Style’ (*Modern Painters*, vol. iii. pp. 36–7, &c.), by a skilful application of which the most glaring infidelity might receive canonisation, and the deepest ignorance pass for wisdom. Having recommended them to the attention of those who imagine that language was given for the purpose of clear expression and not of concealment,—let us proceed to illustrate Mr. Ruskin's appreciation of truthfulness in performance, as exhibited by his favourites among

the painters. Such truth, it will be remembered, is claimed by him as the crown of glory for those minute finishers who have banded together by similarities of humour into the school called Pre-Raphaelite. To hear these persons extolled for their literal veracity has always amazed us, even while recollecting the lengths to which advocacy will go in favour of a theory, and the courage with which a sophist can prove affectation to be simplicity and simplicity affectation, should he take up the defence or the attack of *della Cruscanism*. The energy and minuteness with which the Pre-Raphaelite brotherhood have mastered and recorded certain individual details, has not yet taught them truth in arrangement, truth in form, truth in colour, let Mr. Ruskin declare the reverse as loudly as he will. Is it the truth of Mr. Millais' pictures which has caused the Exhibition loungers to pause before them,—these to scoff,—those to pray? Or is it the truth of some solitary expression, some accessory decoration so preternaturally wrought out as to atone by its special virtue for half a hundred absurdities? The fact is, that these artists mistake a puerile and servile fidelity to certain minute details for that broader character of truth which affects the whole mind of the spectator; and as all details are in nature infinite, for one object which is delineated with distressing precision, a hundred others are slurred over or distorted. Yet these analytical principles of criticism are rigorously and not very fairly applied by Mr. Ruskin. Thus Mr. Maclise is to be cruelly flagellated because he has slighted seven circular golden ornaments in the Duke's robe, in his picture of the wrestling scene from 'As you 'Like it' (*vide* Exhibition Notes, &c. p. 9.); Mr. Herbert is to be reproached for the 'profile of firwood' given to his 'Cordelia' and for the mistaken lights in the four jewels of his 'Lear's Coronet;' but in the works of the Pre-Raphaelites, blue flesh-tints, bad drawing, and the miserable conceits of the monkish painters are to be admired, because they happen to be the objects of his predilection. We do not undervalue the talents of Mr. Millais and Mr. Hunt, but the service rendered to them by Mr. Ruskin is of a questionable character, since he has laboured to confirm them in their peculiar defects, and to render them supremely ridiculous in the eyes of the public.

There is such a thing as colour-blindness. Every one has heard the story of the excellent Quaker philosopher who believed that he was bearing testimony to the saving grace of drab, when he was in fact clad in a scarlet coat. By some such natural infirmity in Mr. Ruskin, if we may speak with disrespect of any of his faculties, we can alone account for his

repeated abuse of the Palladian style of architecture as grey, melancholy, and not admitting of colour. It is true that Buonarrotti's dome of St. Peter's exists,—it is true any one could appeal to the myriad of Jesuit churches, gorgeous with all that parti-coloured marble can do, and gold, crimson, and purple decoration, to remind us that the matter is not as Mr. Ruskin has stated it,—but what are these examples against his authority?

When he speaks of a modern landscape-painter, whom he wishes to demolish, because of his over-neatness, in order to extol Turner's slovenliness as sublime, he becomes poetical in the deification of dirt.

'And this, by the way,' (says Mr. Ruskin, *à propos* of Mr. Stanfield,) 'ought to be noted respecting modern painters in general, that they have not a proper sense of the value of dirt. Cottage children never appear but in freshly got up caps and aprons, and white-handed beggars excite compassion in unexceptionable rags. In reality, almost all the colours of things associated with human life, derive something of their expression and value from the tones of impurity.' (*Modern Painters*, revised ed., p. 120.)

But when it suits Mr. Ruskin to prate concerning 'the nature of Gothic,' in order that he may destroy all art and all artists that are not Gothic, Byzantine, or Pre-Raphaelite, he changes his tone and reverses his sentence. Listen to him, when, in 'The Stones of Venice,' it suits his humour to make an end of Murillo as a painter of beggar-boys:—

'But observe another point in the lower figure of the Dulwich Gallery picture. It lies so that the sole of the foot is turned towards the spectator, not because it would have lain less easily in another attitude, but that the painter may draw, and exhibit, the grey dust engrained in the foot. Do not call this the painting of nature, it is mere delight in foulness. The lesson, if there be any, in the picture, is not one whit the stronger. We all know that a beggar's bare foot cannot be clean; there is no need to thrust its degradation into the sight, as if no human imagination were vigorous enough for its conception.' (Vol. ii. p. 193.)

Another example of self-contradiction we shall give, even more emphatic than these amazing theories of cleanness and uncleanness, since it refers to a branch of art at which Mr. Ruskin has laboured unceasingly,—especially since it has pleased him to advocate the Pre-Raphaelites, because of their affinity to the monkish missal painters in their love of gay colours. In this third volume of 'Modern Painters' he denounces our times as sad, though the sadness is 'noble sadness,' as compared with the times of old, when the monks were such brave

colourists. This sadness, he says, we moderns evince by our love of grave, and melancholy, and mixed hues,—of bad greys, dirty ash colours, and the like. What, then, are we to make of such a definition of good colour as the following?—

‘The fact is, that, of all God’s gifts to the sight of man, colour is the holiest, the most divine, the most solemn. We cannot speak rashly of gay colour and sad colour, *for colour cannot at once be good and gay.*’ (*Stones of Venice*, vol. ii. p. 145.)

It would seem impossible to exceed these examples of childish inconsistency; but Mr. Ruskin enables us to do so. It will be remembered by all who are familiar with the first volume of his ‘*Modern Painters*,’ that among the chapters most admired as profound, convincing, and novel, was one in which Turner’s superior knowledge of the regions of the air, and his familiarity with cloud, mist, and other atmospheric phenomena, were signalised as an advance on the practice of the elder painters. Mr. Ruskin has, however, recently entangled himself in the love of ‘*luminousness*,’ and pure colour,—he defends semi-savage instinct, as possessing the only true system of colouring; and to abuse the times we are living in, he condemns the increased tendency of modern landscape-painters to look upwards, as follows:—

‘The aspects of sunset and sunrise,’ he says, ‘with all their attendant phenomena of cloud and mist, are watchfully delineated; and in ordinary daylight landscape, the sky is considered of so much importance, that a principal mass of foliage, or a whole foreground, is unhesitatingly thrown into shade, merely to bring out the form of a white cloud. So that if a general and characteristic name were needed for modern landscape art, none better could be invented than the service of clouds. And this name would, *unfortunately*, be characteristic of our art in more ways than one.’ (*Modern Painters*, vol. iii. pp. 254–5.)

Surely to nothing in modern art can the above definition be more ‘*unfortunate*’ than to Mr. Ruskin’s credit as the teacher of a new creed. In the first volume of ‘*Modern Painters*,’ pages were devoted by him to Turner’s drawing of Coventry, ‘as a further example of this fine suggestion of irregularity and fitness, through very constant parallelism of duration, both in rain and clouds.’ Ten years ago he could delight in such admirable effects as ‘the rolling cloud,’ ‘the twisted rain,’ the ‘gusty changefulness of the wind,’ ‘flickering sunshine,’ ‘fleeting shadow,’ ‘gushing water,’ ‘*silent flakes of the highest cirrus*,’ &c. But now, in his third volume, Mr. Ruskin tells us that such love of cloud-painting is ‘*unfortunate*,’—he preaches that all ‘sincere and modest art’ (amongst us) is profane—‘Pre-

‘Raphaëlism excepted;’—profane because our darkness of heart, want of faith, ‘profanity of temper,’ are shown in a strong tendency to ‘deny the sacred element of colour—in our ‘sombreness, sadness, preference of mist,’—devotion to the ‘service of clouds,’ and the like!

But not merely does Mr. Ruskin contradict in one volume the definitions which he has laid down in some former book, he will be found, in one and the same chapter, giving himself a licence beyond the bounds of common sophistry. Let us recommend to all who are curious to see how far absurdity will venture, to study the ninth chapter of this third volume of ‘Modern Painters,’ which is devoted to ‘Finish.’ In opening this subject our author innocently admits, that ‘the reader must ‘be almost tired of hearing about truth;’ and, possibly for this very reason in the sequel, a double-refined dose of fallacy is served up to him.

If we turn back to a few high-flown passages in the ‘Seven Lamps of Architecture,’ we shall find the Oracle recommending to the Workman, among the sacrifices which the latter is called on to make, some such exercise of his craft as the following:—

‘Cut one or two shafts out of a porphyry, whose preciousness those only know who would desire it to be so used; add another month’s labour to the undercutting of a few capitals, whose delicacy will not be seen nor loved by one beholder out of ten thousand; *see that the simplest masonry of the edifice be perfect and substantial*, and to those who regard such things, their virtues will be clear and impressive.’ (*Seven Lamps: Lamp of Sacrifice*, p. 17.)

Now let the workman see what light the writer of this third volume of ‘Modern Painters’ will throw upon his delicacy of undercutting, and his perfection of masonry:—

‘There are many little things which to do admirably is to waste both time and cost. . . . So far as finish is bestowed for purposes of polish, there is much to be said against it: this first, and very strongly, that the qualities aimed at in common finishing, namely, smoothness, *delicacy*, or fineness, cannot in reality *exist*, in a degree worth admiring in any thing done by human hands. . . . God alone can finish; and the more intelligent the human mind becomes, the more infiniteness of interval is felt between human and divine work in this respect. *So that it is not a little absurd to weary ourselves in struggling towards a point which we can never reach, and to exhaust our strength in vain endeavours to produce qualities which exist inimitably and inexhaustibly in the commonest things round us.*’ (*Modern Painters*, vol. iii. pp. 116-7.)

That the porphyry-cutter, who was invited to sacrifice labour for sacrifice’s sake, may not be utterly disheartened by hearing his

struggles after the perfection and delicacy now called 'absurd,' our lecturer, having, in paragraph 'five,' of the same chapter, declared that there is one only Finisher, God, — goes on in paragraph 'seven' to say, 'assuredly there is a meritorious finish;' — and by way of exemplification flies off into the old series of comparisons betwixt Claude and Turner.

This time Mr. Ruskin accuses the French painter of folly and falsity in the drawing of his trees, because 'the trunks of trees fork, and fork mostly into two arms at a time . . . but under *'as stern anatomical law as the limbs of an animal.'* (p. 123.) To this law Mr. Ruskin goes on to say Claude was disobedient; and abuses him as 'singularly wrong' in his boughs and stems, denouncing them because they 'are stiff and yet have no strength; curved, and yet have no flexibility; monotonous, and yet disorderly; unnatural, and yet uninventive.' This diatribe is accompanied by a sheet of examples. But in the face of his diagrams Mr. Ruskin must be called upon to prove, first, the 'stern anatomical law' appealed to; secondly, that these very specimens outrage it. If so, Nature is full of such outrages; and, as usual, Mr. Ruskin will at once furnish us with a peremptory contradiction of this assertion. When he says that 'the trunks and boughs of trees are under as stern anatomical law *'as the limbs of an animal,'* he must be understood to mean, that any deviation from the rectilinear proportions of the skeleton are alike offensive in vegetable and in animal nature; and to exemplify this paradox, a diagram of a distorted human form is introduced to illustrate the growth of Claude's trees. But in the very next page all this is reversed.

'Study this bit of Turner's work, note the subtle curvatures within the narrowest limits, and, when it branches, the unexpected, out-of-the-way things it does, just what nobody would have thought of its doing; shooting out like a letter Y with a nearly straight branch, and then correcting its stiffness with a zigzag behind. In what I have to say about trees, I shall need to dwell much on this character of unexpectedness. *A bough is never drawn rightly if it is not wayward.*' (*Modern Painters*, vol. iii. p. 124.)

So that in one passage, trees are described as under 'the same *'stern anatomical laws as the limbs of an animal,'* but in the next lines 'waywardness' and 'unexpectedness' are the indispensable characteristics of the treatment of vegetable forms by a great artist.

As we proceed in this singular chapter, more curious still are the licences of definition which we have to master. Mr. Ruskin here, as elsewhere (especially in his architectural lucubrations), insists on the necessity of all the work which is nearest to the

eye being the most delicate, forgetting that if the eye be fixed by such delicacy, there is small chance of its passing beyond the obtrusive detail to take in the entire scene, of which that detail is merely an accessory portion. In what manner does our lecturer recommend the truth of this canon to be tested? . 'If you will lie down on your breast on the 'next bank you come to (which is bringing it *close* enough, 'I should think, to give it all the force it is capable of), you will 'see clusters of leaves and grass close to your face.' No doubt we may; and Mr. Ruskin favours us with a delicate drawing of leaves and grass (some of the latter, by the way, with its roots uppermost), to prove that the popular notion of 'making 'foregrounds "vigorous," "marked," "forcible," "and so on,"' is a lie, the propagation and acceptance of which is 'wonderful.' But unless we are to look on painted landscape as a snail, a field-mouse, or a ground-lark does — though by lying down on our breasts we may learn what spathe and stem and straw are like, — we shall learn little for a painter's use. What is more (and this will sufficiently show the wanton incoherence of Mr. Ruskin's use of language) after having thus solemnly spoken of such minute and close study of insulated details as a true test of 'finish,' — he cites as foremost among the finishers the very two men whose pictures beyond almost any that exist will bear no near intimacy, 'no lying down on 'the breast' close to their shells or pebbles, or thistle-tufts in the foreground — Titian and Tintoret; many of whose effects can only be seized from that arbitrary distance which the scene-painter calculates with mathematical nicety to make up for want of finish. That 'scenic' and 'minute' can bear the same meaning will seem inconceivable to those who have not studied the novel shades of English employed by Mr. Ruskin. But, supposing outline and picture admitted to be one and the same thing — supposing that a Covent Garden background and a Petitot enamel can be tried by the same rule, the student's faith in Mr. Ruskin's definitions is called to undergo yet more severe trials. The desire for perfection denounced by our Oracle as 'base,' because too audacious in its emulation of the One 'only finisher,' must be further reconciled with such a saying as this, '*that no truly great man can be named in the Arts, but it is that of one who finished to 'his utmost.*' (Modern Painters, vol. iii. p. 127.) And Francia, Angelico, Durer, Hemling, Perugino, are to be extolled, because there is 'the same striving in all to such utmost perfection as their knowledge and hand could reach.' (p. 128.) Mr. Ruskin trusts much to the modesty or to the forgetfulness of

his readers; but he has trusted too much. Few of them can have forgotten that this author, who bids us admire the borage blossoms, painted petal by petal, in Titian's 'Supper at Emmaus,' and the snail-shells in the 'Entombment,' was but the other day the impassioned advocate of Turner, who, in the foreground of most of his recent landscapes, neglected delicacy of finish altogether.

Closely akin to this arrogance, which enables the lecturer to define as he pleases, in order that he may defend what he pleases, is the abuse of interpretation, as applied by him to what others have said or done. Incorrectness of observation, incoherence of system, are but (as it were) two leaves of the trefoil. To adopt Mr. Ruskin's own jargon—'by stern anatomical law' the third leaf must be injustice in imputation; and this has been rarely if ever carried further than in this series of books. Let us illustrate Mr. Ruskin's real power of dealing with great works of art by his appreciation of Raphael;—for we can discover nothing more decisive of his true value as a critic. According to Mr. Ruskin, Raphael thought of the Madonna somewhat after the following fashion:—

'He could think of the Madonna now very calmly, with no desire to pour out the treasures of earth at her feet, or crown her brow with the golden shafts of heaven. He could think of her as an available subject for the display of transparent shadows, skilful tints, and scientific foreshortenings,—as a fair woman, forming, if well painted, a pleasant piece of furniture for the corner of a boudoir, and best imagined by a combination of the beauties of the prettiest *contadinas*. He could think of her, in her last maternal agony, with academical discrimination; sketch in first her skeleton, invest her, in serene science, with the muscles of misery and the fibres of sorrow; then cast the grace of antique drapery over the nakedness of her desolation, and fulfil, with studious lustre of tears and delicately painted pallor, the perfect type of the "Mater Dolorosa."'
(*Modern Painters*, vol. iii. p. 52.)

It is impossible to apply the above description to the *Madonna di San Sisto*, to the *Madonna di Foligno*, without a quick protest of indignation. But the feeling need be but momentary. There is something in the coxcombrity of Mr. Ruskin's allotment to Raphael of some pretty qualities and painstaking disposition—taken in conjunction with what he says of the 'kicking gracefulness' of the accessory figures in Raphael's 'Transfiguration,'—which disarms us by the excess of its conceit. The Dogmatists and the Dellacruscans, after all, have much in common—the same exquisite self-satisfaction, the same delight in adjectives and epithets; the same happy assurance, that in their lips jargon becomes poetry; and flat assertion accepted truth.

In point of fact, Mr. Ruskin appears to us to be utterly incapable of comprehending either the greatness of conception or the refinement and ingenuity of execution, which mark the highest productions of the great painters. His mind is so unfortunately constituted that he analyses to the last excess what is intended to produce effect as a whole, though he generalises in the same sweeping and extravagant manner when he is dealing with particulars. Let us take, for example, his observations on that admirable and affecting work of Raphael, the 'Charge to Peter,' which even in the gallery of the cartoons is conspicuous above all its fellows for sublime and supernatural effect. Mr. Ruskin's description of that solemn scene amounts to this, that a couple of fishermen are tumbling over their nets on the beach of the Sea of Galilee, and that the others join them in the presence of Our Lord and 'eat their broiled fish as he bids.'

'And then to Peter, all dripping still, shivering and amazed, staring at Christ in the sun on the other side of the coal fire, thinking a little, perhaps, of what happened by another coal fire, when it was colder, and having had no word once changed with him by his Master since that look of his; to him, so amazed, comes the question, "Simon, lovest thou me?" Try to feel that a little, and think of it till it is true to you; and then take up *that infinite monstrosity and hypocrisy* — Raphael's cartoon of the Charge to Peter. Note first the bold fallacy — the putting *all* the Apostles there, a mere lie to serve the papal heresy of the Petric supremacy, by putting them all in the back ground, while Peter receives the charge, and making them all witnesses to it. Note the handsomely curled hair and neatly tied sandals of the men who had been out all night in the sea-mists and on the slimy decks. Note their convenient dresses for going a fishing, with trains that lie a yard along the ground, and goodly fringes, — all made to match, an apostolic fishing costume. Note how Peter especially (whose chief glory was in his wet coat *girt* about him and naked limbs), is enveloped in folds and fringes, so as to kneel and hold his keys with grace. No fire of coals at all, nor lonely mountain shore, but a pleasant Italian landscape, full of villas and churches, and a flock of sheep to be pointed at; and the whole group of Apostles, not round Christ, as they would have been naturally, but straggling away in a line that they may all be shown.

'The simple truth is, that the moment we look at the picture we feel our belief of the whole thing taken away. There is visibly no possibility of that group ever having existed, in any place or on any occasion. It is all a mere mythic absurdity, and faded concoction of fringes, muscular arms,' and curly head of Greek philosophers.' (*Modern Painters*, vol. iii. p. 54.)

As this is Mr. Ruskin's verdict on one of the finest works of Raphael, we are content to leave the worth of his writings to

be weighed against the worth of that picture. That one or the other deserves the charge of 'infinite monstrosity and hypo-crisy' we have no doubt; but that one is *not* the work of Raphael. In the absence of any higher or better feelings in Mr. Ruskin, a little humility might have spared us the pain of quoting a passage which is an outrage on the public taste; but to all such feelings it would be vain in this case to appeal. The charge of Christ to Peter, painted by a Catholic artist for the head of the Catholic Church, represents of course the divine commission to which that church lays claim. But it also breathes the sublime spirit of that interview in which the Saviour, after his resurrection, assumed a more than human majesty and authority. The scene Raphael depicted was not that of a party of fishermen eating broiled fish on the beach of Galilee, but the solemn foundation of the Church itself, at once real and allegorical, and the parting charge of Christ to his disciples. It has been finely remarked by Mrs. Jameson, in speaking of the cartoons, that in them *the sense of power super-sedes the appearance of effort*. But the sense of power is wanting in Mr. Ruskin; and whilst he mouths and gesticulates in presence of works which command the devout admiration of mankind, he is apparently unconscious that the deficiency he indicates is not in them but in himself.

Nor is it only the painters denounced by Mr. Ruskin, on whom he turns the 'lamp' of his imputation and interpretation—he is still more weighty, still more marvellous, still more unerring, when he tells us how the poets whom he worships made their poems,—entering into the chambers of imagery belonging to the mighty dead,—instructing us why they left what they did leave there untouched,—and what we are to think of all they have given us. In these chapters Mr. Ruskin has attempted to apply to literary criticism the principles which have led him to such unexpected conclusions in examining the works of the great painters; and we suspect that if the whole truth were told he is of opinion that as the art of landscape-painting began with the late Mr. Turner, so the art of fine writing began with Mr. Carlyle and himself, for he respectfully informs us that Mr. Carlyle is above all men the 'guide, philosopher, and friend,' of the author of these disquisitions. When, however, he asserts that all minute observation and relish of the aspects of Nature, such as bear on landscape-painting, is a modern invention (which he assumes, with a simple patronage of Dante, Homer, Shakspeare, that is edifying), he goes too far, in reasoning from his own particular habits to the general tastes and tendencies of thoughtful and poetical men.

That the Greek may have been epicurean in his preference for landscape, 'when subservient to human comfort, to the foot, to the taste, to the smell,' is possible. That the mediæval 'priest or layman, lover, or monk,' may have restricted his intercourse with Nature within the seven divisions so tersely laid down by Mr. Ruskin, is also conceivable. Easy and fascinating, however, as is this manner of pronouncing on the sympathies, desires, and dreams of man belonging to the elder world, it can only be indulged in with some caution. Although expatiation and minute description are modern practices, such things as a love, a passion for, an intimacy with, Nature have existed and have been cherished among those who neither trained the recording hand nor commanded the discriminating tongue. Other eyes than those of Superstition may, in the old days, have watched the piled clouds of evening, and regarded them for their own beauty's sake, not as portents foretelling battles red with blood, or pestilence covering the land as with a pall. The monk may have frequented his small enclosure of garden with other thoughts beyond those of the simples and herbs which eked out his fare, and furnished him with his healing balsams. Indeed, Mr. Ruskin himself (skilled at advocating both sides of an argument) devotes one of his most elaborate chapters to explain that the writers of old who described Nature are not to be read by the dictionary of their own academies, but by the divining sense of a skilled reader.

His commentary on Dante, contained in chap. xiv. (of this third volume of 'Modern Painters'), exhibits sophism in its most elaborate form of pedantic self-complacency. What, for instance, as published by a teacher of Art, and an illustrator of Art from the poets, can be more irresistible than a couple of passages such as the following? In the first we shall find that the poet of the 'Divina Commedia' is complimented as having shown the accuracy of a daguerreotype in depicting a grotesque precisely as Mr. Ruskin knows such a grotesque existed and behaved. No poet, our author has asserted, can describe with any felicity unless he draws 'either from the bodily life or the life of faith.'

'For instance,' continues the passage, 'Dante's Centaur, Chiron, dividing his beard with his arrow before he can speak, is a thing that no mortal would ever have thought of, if he had not actually seen the Centaur do it. They might have composed handsome bodies of men and horses, in all possible ways, through a whole life of pseudo-idealism, and yet never dreamed of any such thing. But the real living Centaur actually trotted across Dante's brain, and he saw him do it.' (*Modern Painters*, vol. iii. p. 85.)

The hyperbolic nonsense of this compliment is worthy of the best period of the *Convettisti*; and only to be surpassed

by the bombast elsewhere used by Mr. Ruskin to describe that 'supernatural lion of Tintoret (in his picture of the Doge Loredano before the Madonna), *'with the plumes of his mighty wings clashed together in cloud-like repose;'* or by the pedantry of Mr. Ruskin's speculations on the nature and properties of griffins true and false. But the modern seer has yet more of the mighty Florentine's secrets in his intimate keeping. If we proceed a few chapters further, we shall find that if Dante was actual in showing us how a trotting Centaur can behave, he laid on his colours very awkwardly when attempting to describe Nature. After running riot among the reasons of the Mediævalists for their choice in colouring, — not forgetting a thrust at *Renaissance* architects for having brought into Art meal-colour and ash-colour, 'with all their woes,' — Mr. Ruskin proceeds as follows: —

'Both colours, grey and brown, were to them (the mediævals) hues of distress, despair, and mortification — hence always adopted for the dresses of monks: only the word "brown" bore in their colour-vocabulary a still gloomier sense than with us. I was for some time embarrassed by Dante's use of it with respect to dark skies and water. Thus, in describing a simple twilight, not a Hades twilight, but an ordinarily fair evening (Inf. ii. 1.), he says, the "brown" air took the animals of earth away from their fatigues: the waves under Charon's boat are "brown" (Inf. iii. 117.); and Lethe, which is perfectly clear and yet dark, is "bruna-bruna," "brown, exceeding brown." Now, clearly, in all these cases, no warmth is meant to be mingled in the colour. Dante had never seen one of our bog-streams, with its porter-coloured foam; and there can be no doubt that in calling Lethe brown, he means it was dark slate grey, inclining to black: as for instance, our clear Cumberland lakes, which, looked straight down upon where they are deep, seem to be lakes of ink. I am sure this is the colour he means; So when he was talking of twilight, his eye for colour was far too good to let him call it *brown* in our sense. Twilight is not brown, but purple, golden, or dark grey: and this last was what Dante meant But one day, just when I was puzzling myself about this, I happened to be sitting by one of our best living modern colourists, watching him at his work, when he said, suddenly, or by mere accident, after we had been talking of other things, "Do you know I have found that there "is no brown in nature?" What we call brown is always a variety of either orange or purple. It never can be represented by umber, unless altered by contrast.' (*Modern Painters*, vol. iii. pp. 240-1.)

We recollect few exercises of autocracy more pleasant than the above. It is consolatory, however, to be assured that Dante knew what purple was though he talked of brown. It would be pleasanter still to hear Mr. Ruskin and the great

‘living colourist,’ his friend, explain the tones of certain pictures by Rembrandt, or by our author’s idol — Tintoret — according to this new arrangement and expurgation of the palette. We do not apprehend that any difficulty would be felt — any discrepancy owned — any shame testified on the occasion. Mr. Ruskin has always some trick at hand to save his own idols from utter destruction.

The interpreter of Art may proclaim himself infallible, while interpreting every other claim to infallibility as evil, mundane, pagan, and prideful. It is in some such fit of wanton inmodesty, that our Oracle, in completion of his defence of incompleteness in this ‘Third Volume,’ exhibits to the worshippers of Art, the utter worthlessness of all teaching — invites them, with the authority of one who has lectured, to believe in no lecturer. It is curious, after all this jargon concerning ‘purple,’ and ‘brown,’ and ‘orange,’ and ‘slate-grey,’ to find Mr. Ruskin pointing out that it is an actual necessity, in order to obtain power of colouring, that a nation should be ‘half savage.’ He asserts that ‘nobody can colour anywhere, except the Hindoos and Chinese;’ and records his assurance that ‘in a little while, people will find out their mistake, and give up talking about rules of colour, and then everybody will colour again, as easily as they now talk.’ — Was it needful to write a library of precepts only to arrive at such a precept as this?

As a last illustration of the spirit in which this book ‘of many things’ is written, — of the truth which may be expected from its author, — of the soundness of his judgment as a critic, — and of his self-respect as a collector diligent in qualifying himself for his task, — let us advert to his dealings with what may be called the collateral branches of his subject. Mr. Ruskin treats of the relations of Art with civilisation and society, and its reflection in literature, in the 16th and 17th chapters of this third volume, — those devoted to ‘Modern Landscape,’ and to ‘the Moral of Landscape.’ That one who has fathomed the secrets of the ancient authors should also be able anew to judge and appraise the moderns, can be no mystery or cause of surprise. That a lecturer on Art, who points out the uselessness of all lecturing to the artist, who would have the student fling to the winds all such academical discoveries as perspective and *chiaro scuro*, who delivers his testimony in favour of bright colours, which can only reach their perfection when the colourist is in a state of savagery, — should also hold peculiar ideas in morals, and politics, and civilisation, was but to be expected. These ‘Latter-day Prophets’ deal with no question by halves. Thus we find Mr. Ruskin

launching off into the old diatribe against modern inventions and modern society, with a huge disdain of fact and possibility. The progress of the human intellect (a divine gift entrusted to Man for Man's improvement) is denounced, as a cheating and feverish delusion; and our author declares that the highest faculties of the human creature should be devoted uninterruptedly to watch the corn grow or the blossoms set,—to 'draw hard breath 'over ploughshare and spade.' Long before this new school of believers in barbarism sprung up, the sceptics, tired of all established religions, were in the habit of expressing their discontent by satirising every sign of progress and civilisation. Long before Mr. Ruskin began to rhapsodise in favour of his stripes of primitive scarlet and blue, the painted savage was set up by many a French *bel esprit* and *philosophe* as a living example of wisdom, experience, and virtue, deserving the worship of rational and educated creatures. To denounce what never can be undone, to preach what never can be done, is one of the most stale resources of the fanatic; but it denotes a mind unsettled in its convictions, unstable in its principles, and falling from paradox to paradox into the abyss of scepticism and infidelity. For, as if resolute to destroy all such respect for his sincerity, as may linger in some corner of the hearts of those who have been enchanted by sonorous periods and bold assertions, in the seventeenth and eighteenth chapters of this 'Third Volume,' Mr. Ruskin does his best to discredit all minute observation of Nature as a humour characteristic of modern times, as false, morbid, and belonging to a time of unbelief and to a race of blasphemers!

Few essays by a man in whom trust has been reposed, and in whom genius must be recognised, are more amazing than Mr. Ruskin's lucubrations on the authors whom he refers to as having written concerning Nature, or than his classification of those among whom the passion for Nature was intense or subordinate. Walter Scott we are told was sorrowful, sceptical as an author, 'inherently and consistently sad;' a politician whose 'love of liberty was at the root of all his Jacobite tendencies in politics; a man who believed in "destiny"' (which Mr. Ruskin defines to be 'not a matter of faith at all, but of sight'). But the love of Nature was *intense* in Anne Radclyffe (whose moon that rose twice in the same night has been a stock joke for these twenty years past); it is intense in M. Eugene Sue, who is credited with having produced a beautiful pastoral scene in 'Les Mystères de Paris' having *Fleur de Marie* for its shepherdess;—whereas in Milton, despite of his 'L'Allegro,'

despite of his 'Lycidas,' despite of his 'Paradise Lost,' the love of Nature is described as '*subordinate*.'

We shall not follow Mr. Ruskin through the pages of æsthetic auto-biography by which he has illustrated the 'Moral of Landscape,' from the day when this infant prodigy was taken by his nurse to the brow of Friar's Crag on Derwent-water, to the time when Scott's Monastery became his favourite book, and he lived 'with a general presence of White Lady everywhere.' These particulars will no doubt be of permanent interest to those who may hereafter examine the life of so remarkable an individual. Nor can we charge ourselves with an analysis of the political rhapsody which terminates this volume, though we are told in Mr. Ruskin's finest language, that 'the helmed and sworded skeleton, that rakes with its white fingers the sands of the Black Sea beach into grave heap after grave heap, washed by everlasting surf of tears, has been to our countrymen an angel of other things than agony' (p. 335.): and that 'the scarlet of the blood which has sealed this covenant will be poured along the clouds of a new Aurora, glorious in that eastern heaven; for every sob of wreck-fed breaker round those Pontic precipices, the floods shall clap their hands between the guarded mounts of the Prince Angel.' (p. 339.) To these elevated regions it is impossible for us to pursue Mr. Ruskin, and as for the 'guarded mounts of the Prince Angel' we have not a conception where they are, unless this singular expression conveys an allusion to St. Michael's Mount, which is now turned into a prison or a madhouse.

We have already bestowed on this volume more space than its merits deserve, but its gross and glaring extravagancies and defects constitute a strong claim to notice. It is the worst book of a bad series of books, mischievous to art, mischievous to literature, but mischievous above all to those young and eager minds, animated by the love of art and of literature, which may mistake this declamatory trash for substantial or stimulating food. We are the less disposed to acquit Mr. Ruskin because he is not altogether without faculties which might have made him a useful and an elegant writer. His style, when it is not too inflated, is generally perspicuous and sometimes forcible: his perceptions are acute; he is not devoid of industry or even of taste. But all these qualities are perverted and destroyed by the entire absence of masculine judgment, by the failure of the logical faculty, and by a strange propensity to mistake the illusions of his own fancy or his own vanity for the laws of reality and the principles of truth. .

- ART. VIII.—1. *De l'Avenir Politique de l'Angleterre.* Par le Comte de MONTALEMBERT. Paris: 1856.
2. *La Réforme Administrative en Angleterre.* Par M. CHARLES DE RÉMUSAT. (*Revue de Deux Mondes.*) Paris: 1855.
3. *L'Angleterre au dix-huitième Siècle.* Par M. CHARLES DE RÉMUSAT. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1856.

IT is very rarely that one nation thoroughly comprehends or cordially appreciates another. The difficulties in the way of such intimate understanding are enormous. Often the will is wanting: often the power. National jealousies and national vanity, ancestral hostility, dissimilar antecedents, discrepancy of genius, variety of origin, instinctive antipathy of race (using the word antipathy in its etymological signification), difference of government and institutions, giving rise to feelings half of envy, half of mistrust, — all these are so many barriers to mutual penetration and reciprocal admiration. Between no two people equally remarkable for power and civilisation, do so many obstacles of this sort exist as between the English and the French. Both eminently intellectual and energetic; with our histories closely intertwined for many centuries in amity or war; a large portion of the French territory having been once under English rule; the whole of England having been conquered by a race of French birth, if not properly of French extraction; half the language of our Court and of our Law having long continued to be Norman; with political arrangements originally identical, and, for a long period, cognate and sympathetic; and divided locally by only a narrow strip of water, which our ships can traverse twelve times in the four and twenty hours, — we yet have rarely done each other ready justice, and still more rarely felt for each other any frank or hearty affection. Occasionally, indeed, Englishmen of somewhat Gallic tendencies of mind, or Frenchmen cast in a British mould, or natives of either country long resident in the other, have been able to perceive that the one national character is, in a manner, the supplement and completion of the other, and that the blending of the two might produce a race of nearly ideal excellence; but as a rule the two peoples have remained incurably apart, — fierce foes when at war, and, even when at peace and in alliance, rather in juxtaposition than in union. The political changes which time has wrought on both sides of the Channel; the various revolutions which our neighbours have undergone; the democratic tendencies which

our own constitution has betrayed; and the reciprocal study which the increased attention given every where to the science of government has occasioned, have, no doubt, of late years done much to promote greater mutual interest and respect. We each of us admire, and seek to imitate, much of what we see in the other: they have borrowed largely from our Parliamentary forms,—we have learned much from their Administrative system; but much still remains which is reciprocally perplexing and repellent. The French look with amazement and incredulity upon our inveterate habit of grumbling and self-depreciation; we look with something of contempt upon their tendency to self-laudation, upon their disposition to exaggerate successes, and to conceal or extenuate disasters. Our pride takes a form which they cannot comprehend: their love of glory descends to proceedings to which we are perhaps unwarrantably severe. Neither nation is very tolerant to faults which are the opposite of its own. Our several mental qualities and special excellences, too, are curiously incongruous. In political affairs our clumsy and blundering successes are as great a source of surprise to them, as their scientific and skilfully arranged failures are to us. The conversation of a French statesman displays a clearness of view, a precision of intellect, and a comprehensiveness of knowledge and of survey, which are at once our admiration and our despair: yet discomfiture and defeat too often wait on the practical attempt to realise his plans. The confused, incoherent, unpremeditated expositions of the English leader of high repute disappoint and astound his French *confrère*: yet somehow or other a certain rough good sense, which is wholly unapparent in conversation, conducts him floundering, but effectually, to his end. The very logical perfection of the Frenchman leads him astray by ostensibly irrefragable steps pushed to an extreme: an Englishman's mistrust of logic and fondness for what is incomplete and cautious, constantly preserves him from error by suggesting indefensible, yet feasible, compromises.* The one has, in the

* This peculiarity has not escaped M. de Montalembert. 'Tout d'abord l'Angleterre, heureusement pour elle, ne pratique pas le culte de la logique. Elle s'est de tout temps réservé l'usage illimité de la plus éclatante inconséquence, avec le droit de ne pas sacrifier sa gloire, son bonheur, et sa sécurité, à une logique plus ou moins irréprochable. Elle ne permet pas à des esprits chimériques, violents et absolus, de l'égarer par leur déductions et de l'opprimer par leur conclusions. . . . C'est là qu'éclate surtout la sagesse supérieure dont cette nation est douée. Après avoir posé ou accepté un principe, elle ne se laisse pas conduire en son nom à

highest degree, the instinct of action,—the other the gift of intelligence. The scientific man brings to his work a splendid case of instruments, with *mètres* and *millimètres* innumerable: the comparatively uneducated practical man perplexes and disgusts his rival by an obstinate and unreasoning, yet successful, adherence to ‘the rule of thumb.’

Writers, therefore, in either land, to whom favouring circumstances or inherent sympathy have given an insight into the characteristics of the neighbouring nation, can scarcely render a greater service than by endeavouring to extend this insight to their countrymen; especially at a conjuncture like the present, when an intimate alliance and a close interweaving of interests make it peculiarly important that no misconception or want of cordial sentiment should be suffered to exist. Few men in France are more qualified to undertake this good work than the two eminent politicians whose writings we have placed at the head of our article,—widely different as they are in character, position, and antecedents. M. de Rémusat, long a member of the Chamber of Deputies under Louis Philippe, a liberal Orleanist of the *nuance* Thiers, and formerly Minister of the Interior in the administration of that statesman, has, since the *coup-d'état*, been an indefatigable contributor to the pages of the ‘*Revue des Deux Mondes*,’ the most influential and highly reputed publication in France and, indeed, of the entire Continent. He has long laboured to explain to his readers the peculiarities and anomalies of our constitution and our character: he has studied both most carefully, and appears to us to have penetrated their spirit thoroughly, and to comprehend every thing except some matters of detail which a foreigner can scarcely ever master. He admires us with a cordiality which is very rare, and yet with a critical and discriminating appreciation which renders his admiration the more gratifying. Perhaps the four Frenchmen who best understand England are M. de Rémusat, Count Montalembert, M. Guizot, and the Emperor; and of these we incline to think that the first does us the most perfect justice,—partly from more minute study, partly from instinctive sympathy, but still more from a peculiarity of mind which is rare in any land, and rarest of all probably in France. M. de Rémusat’s enemies (if he have any) say that he has no convictions: his friends prefer to

‘l’utopie ou à l’abîme. Elle se défie même avec raison de l’empire
‘des théories, qui sont en politique, plus que partout ailleurs, sujettes
‘à caution, et l’on peut dire que son histoire est celle d’une lutte
‘constante contre les conséquences exagérées des principes qu’elle a
‘reconnus ou subis.’

express the same idea by saying that he has no prejudices. His mind is essentially passionless and philosophic; he has nothing of the partisan about him; his preferences are too feeble to obscure his judgment; a mental temperament of singular coldness, an unusual amount of intellectual fairness, joined to a luminous and calm penetration, and a wide range of illustrative knowledge, give him rare advantages for arriving at the truth. And the article (*'La Réforme Administrative en Angleterre'*)—which he published last year, just at the moment when our Press was vituperating with the most grotesque and contradictory exaggerations our whole class of governors and our whole system of government, and when the Continent was listening with implicit credulity and eager malice—is a master-piece of lucid exposition, candid appreciation, and creditable feeling.

M. de Montalembert's volume—originally published in *'Le Correspondant'*, a semi-religious periodical—is a work similar in tone and object. Count Montalembert is well known as one of the most eminent orators and politicians of France; and two years ago his name was in every mouth, *à propos* of his prosecution by the Government for a most daring and admirable letter to M. Dupin, which he wrote, but did not publish. His career and character are somewhat remarkable. Born in England, of an English mother; the last hereditary peer of France who entered the Upper Chamber before its hereditary nature was abolished; a devout and fervent Catholic, yet an enthusiastic liberal; exhausting his ingenuity to reconcile these two incompatibilities, to persuade himself and the world that the union is not a paradox, and to escape from the false positions in which his rival loves involve him; always in opposition, always in hot water, always in extremes; securing his own condemnation before even the most friendly tribunal by the fierceness of his onslaught on the Judges, who would fain have absolved him; betraying every cause he pleaded by the reckless and aggressive vehemence of his advocacy; 'the very Rupert of debate'; yet undeniably one of the most eloquent, earnest, and daring men in France. A steady adherent of no party, because, hoping to use each in turn for the furtherance of his own views, especially in connexion with the Church of Rome, and deserting and assailing each when he was foiled in the design; combative by nature, and keeping no measure in his combativeness; keen, mordant, and intolerant in his promiscuous sarcasm and his terrible invective; and, therefore, delighting all parties in turn, as his artillery was directed against each in succession, perpetually impairing his deserved weight by his ungovernable

impetuosity; with all the mental and moral elements of greatness, except one—the keystone of the arch,—he seems destined always to be prominent, but never to be powerful. He has several similitudes among our public men, but no perfect analogy—Lord Derby, if he had any earnestness and any elevation; Mr. Roebuck, if he had more weight and a more defined aim; Mr. Gladstone, if he had less subtilty and more gall; Lord Brougham, if he were what he was in hotter and younger days; would all make a near approach to Count Montalembert's peculiar temperament and position.

M. de Montalembert can hardly be said to have begun his political life before the Revolution of 1830. His first act after that event was to establish, in conjunction with the Abbé de Lamennais, a paper called '*l'Avenir*,' devoted to catholicism and democracy. Scarcely was he of age when he was tried for a clear violation of the law in opening, without authorization from the Government, a school designed to further religious instruction among the poor. His next work was to edit the book of Adam Mickiewicz—'*Les Pèlerins Polonais*,' which was the original germ of Lamennais' celebrated '*Paroles d'un Croyant*'—with a preface filled with the fiercest denunciations of the then condition and administration of France. During the whole of Louis Philippe's reign he was a constant and vehement assailer of the ministry, although ostensibly an Orleanist. He supported Louis-Napoleon on many occasions during his presidency, as 'the legitimate because the only 'possible' Chief of France. After the *coup d'état*, he refused to be a senator, though he expressed in terms which did him no honour his adhesion to that act of violence; yet he soon afterwards declared, amid the rapturous applause of the *Académie Française*, that '*les révolutions finissent toujours par des fous ou par des scélérats*;' he then entered the *Corps Législatif*, where he became an occasional, but not regular opponent of the Emperor; and finally wrote the letter which gave such dire offence at the Tuileries, and to which we have already referred. He is now only forty-six years of age, quite untamed, and possibly with a great, certainly with a stormy future before him.

'Chained to excess, the slave of each extreme,'

he is in nearly every feature of character the very opposite of the moderate and unimpassioned Rémusat; yet he has written in defence and explanation of England at the same critical period and in the same friendly and enlightened spirit.

The circumstances which called forth from these two writers the productions we are considering were grave and critical

enough. 'At the commencement of last year the deplorable sufferings of our Crimean army, caused by the incapacity of men, or the age and rustiness of system, which those sufferings were supposed to indicate, had produced a profound impression throughout Europe. They were laid bare without the slightest reticence by the entire press of England; they were needlessly exaggerated and extravagantly coloured by some of its most powerful organs; they were not only affirmed in the most unmeasured language by opposition orators in Parliament, but were avowed by the ministerial leader in the House of Commons to be 'horrible, heart-rending, and unaccountable.' These statements, given to the world on such unquestionable authority, were, naturally enough, propagated on the Continent with eager iteration. That they should have been received there with ready credulity, and, in too many instances, with malignant joy, is no matter for surprise or for complaint; nor that they were everywhere hailed as proofs and symptoms of the weakness and decadence of England. That many friends of liberty both here and abroad should have been staggered and alarmed at a succession of blunders which apparently spoke so ill for the competence of the people and the wisdom of the institutions under which such failures could occur, was natural enough. But we may well feel both regret and shame when we remember that there were not wanting even in this country hundreds of declaimers who could find no other explanation of these sad blunders and shortcomings than the treachery, incapacity, or corruption of our rulers; and not a few writers to whom they suggested nothing better than an extravagant admiration, and a hinted imitation, of the despotic government whose momentary superiority contrasted so strongly with our own condition. It is against the monstrous deductions of these men of feeble vision, scanty charity, and tottering faith, that M. de Montalembert has raised his battery. He addresses himself to prove to continental politicians that England's failures are no indications of England's weakness or approaching fall; and to show to the timid friends of freedom, who neither comprehend her real strength nor are content to pay her necessary price, how immeasurably more vast her resources really are than those of the centralised and arbitrary power for which, in a moment of unworthy panic, they were tempted to exchange her.

And here, at the risk of offending the feelings of some of our parliamentary friends across the Channel, we must say a passing word on a subject which has given rise to much misconstruction and to not a little irritation. The friends of self-government and of representative institutions in France cannot forgive the

English nation for their cordial reception and undisguised admiration of the Ruler who so arbitrarily and violently suppressed those institutions among a neighbouring people. They are exceedingly sore at our acquiescence in their calamity, the readiness of which, they say, bespeaks apathy for their misfortunes, and a profound and insolent conviction of their incapacity or unripeness for those political blessings which we cherish so fondly and so proudly. This soreness breaks out repeatedly in the volume of M. de Montalembert * and the article of M. de Rémusat; and indeed it is universal and extreme among all the Orleanists and most of the Republicans. We are not surprised at the feeling; we feel no inclination to resent the bitterness with which it is sometimes expressed, nor can we altogether deny the justice of the reproach. But our friends have not quite understood the origin and all the causes of the manifestations which have so much annoyed them. They cannot deny that they had, not once but repeatedly, deplorably mismanaged parliamentary government by the extreme behaviour of their factions, and had brought that system into discredit by such mismanagement. We, on our side, may admit that we drew from this mismanagement too harsh and rapid a conclusion as to their unfitness and incompetency, and that we ought to have remembered that our own successful handling of that peculiar and anomalous mode of rule has been the slow growth of centuries of effort, experiment, and failure. We ought to have been more generous and long suffering in our judgment of a people whose conceptions of liberty are so different from our own, though their passion for it may be as vehement and ineradicable. But, on the other hand, they should learn to make allowance for the natural impatience of a sober race who see others, time after time, jeopardise and sacrifice personal independence and civil rights from want of the commonest mutual moderation and forbearance among their factions; and who, if they love liberty as the first of blessings, love tranquillity and security as the second, — as the indispensable condition of its permanence, and as the dearest boon which it can purchase. The liberal party in England, and England generally, accepted the forcible change of government in France,

* 'Enfin, depuis quelques années, l'Angleterre a tellement varié dans son attitude, elle a passé si brusquement des excès de l'invective aux excès de l'adulation; elle a tant oublié, tant dissimulé, tant sacrifié le droit et la liberté à son ambition, à ses craintes, à ses intérêts; elle semblait abdiquer si complètement l'honneur de ses institutions libres devant la force du principe contraire. . . . C'a été le *coup de grâce* pour plus d'un noble cœur parmi nous.' (P. 6.)

though not without great reluctance; they were not insensible to the grave culpability of the proceeding or the arbitrary violence of the blow, but they saw passions and circumstances fast ripening for a civil war; they were grievously alarmed at the imminent prospect of a social convulsion, exceeding in extent and horror all previous ones since 1792; and they saw no other solution of the crisis than in an act of power at once sudden, unconstitutional, and extreme. In short, they believed, rightly or wrongly, that France had arrived at one of 'those dreadful exigencies in which' (to use the words of Mr. Burke) 'morality is compelled to submit to the 'suspension of her own rules in favour of her own principles.' Hence it was not the successful and skilful usurper that we recognised so promptly and absolved perhaps too readily, but the Cromwell who had cut a knot which it seemed that no contrivance could untie, and who, patriotically or selfishly, had saved his country from a great calamity by the commission of a great crime. We left the question of his condemnation or acquittal in abeyance till we should have seen the use which he made of the power so unconstitutionally seized. Not logically perhaps, but after the fashion of our tribe, we reserved our judgment of the past till we could read it by the light of the future.

The cordiality of Louis Napoleon's reception in this country — which was the real gravamen of our national offence — admits of a further explanation. Three or four causes contributed to its enthusiastic character. In the first place we received him, without reference to himself or his antecedents, as the ruler and representative of our great rival nation, with which we had then for the first time formed an offensive and defensive alliance of the closest intimacy. We were anxious to show to FRANCE how hearty was our friendship; how sincere our reconciliation; how generous and earnest our desire to bury in oblivion all former jealousies and animosities; how unfeigned our delight at a union on which we instinctively felt, and deliberately and profoundly believe, so much of the future welfare of Europe and of humanity must hang. Next, it should be remembered that Englishmen have a peculiar and inveterate admiration for all who *have raised themselves* — who are the sons of their own deeds — the architects of their own fortunes. We always do honour to the man, be he lawyer, soldier, or politician, who has risen from nothing. To this feeling was added a vivid recollection of all that was romantic and picturesque in the history of the man then making his progress through unexampled crowds in a royal carriage; —

how he who was now the Queen's guest had once been a special constable in London streets — how he, who was now Emperor of the first nation of the Continent, had seven years before been a poor and obscure exile on our shores. In all this, it must be admitted, there was much to excite the imagination and to excuse the somewhat extravagant ebullition of welcome which waited on his progress through the city. But, again, much of this enthusiasm was due to the lady who accompanied him. Had he come without his Empress, his reception would have been decidedly less warm. Her history, no less than her rare grace and beauty, contributed to this result. If the English people have a weakness for a man who has raised himself from an obscure position, they have another weakness — analogous and not less marked — for a great man who has married for love. The French, we are told, were disappointed because the Emperor had not married a Royal Princess; the English would have deemed it a derogation from his personal grandeur if he had. One thing was wanting to the popularity of George III. with the masses — that he should have married Lady Sarah Lennox in place of a cold and unattractive German. This one crowning claim Louis Napoleon had; and by that, more than by almost any one other characteristic, did he captivate the sympathies of the middle and lower classes of our island. And, in addition to all this, and as a final clue to the explanation of the offensive phenomenon, it cannot be denied that the open, straightforward, cordial, honourable dealing of the Emperor with this country ever since he became our ally, was felt by our statesmen to present a most welcome and favourable contrast with the circumstances which had marked our intercourse with the French Court under both branches of the House of Bourbon.

It may be that all these considerations weighed too strongly in our minds; it may be that we too readily overlooked antecedents which, in the eye of stern moralists, should have cast a shadow over the brilliancy of the actual scene; it may be that we lavished on a child of fortune and successful daring the unmeasured admiration which is strictly due only to genius consecrated to a great cause and to courage hallowed by unselfishness and held in check by humanity and good faith. 'We are not careful to answer in this matter.' But the explanation we have given is the true one, and may serve to explain our conduct in the eyes of the parliamentarians of France.

But it is time to pass on to the consideration of M. de Montalembert's remarks on 'the political future of England.'

The following is his statement of 'the position of the question:—

'Que va devenir l'Angleterre! se demande-t-on partout sur le continent. En Angleterre même, la question doit se poser au fond de plus d'un cœur. Mais en dehors des préoccupations de la politique contemporaine ou du patriotisme alarmé, et pour le petit nombre de ceux qui professent encore le culte de la liberté et de la dignité humaine, il n'y a pas, à l'heure qu'il est, de problème plus vital que celui des destinées prochaines de l'Angleterre.

'Nul ne peut se le dissimuler, il s'est formé de par le monde une opinion défavorable à la sécurité de cette grande nation, à la durée de ses glorieuses institutions, et même à sa moralité politique. La confiance sans bornes, l'envie trop légitime, l'admiration passionnée qu'elle inspirait depuis un siècle aux esprits éclairés, aux âmes généreuses, ont fait place peu à peu à des sentiments très-différents. Pendant que les anciens et fidèles partisans de l'Angleterre et de tout ce qu'elle représente dans le monde en sont encore à la défiance ou à l'appréhension, ses adversaires, en nombre toujours grossissant, appellent et saluent d'avance la chute de la vieille Angleterre. Là comme ailleurs, absolutistes et démocrates s'entendent au fond, pour former les mêmes vœux, applaudir à la même catastrophe. L'Angleterre a trop longtemps confondu les uns et les autres. Elle a donné un trop éclatant démenti à la fausse logique, à la fausse science et aux passions implacables des esprits absolus. Sa force toujours croissante, sa liberté sans bornes, sa prospérité sans rivale fournissent de trop formidables arguments à la fois contre la démagogie socialiste qui veut tout passer au crible d'une égalité sauvage, et contre cette théorie monarchique qui ne sait préserver les peuples du désordre et de la terreur qu'en les refoulant dans le silence et le néant.' (P. 1.)

M. de Rémusat gives a precisely similar account of the state of feeling on the Continent in the early part of last year, produced by the publication of our Crimean disasters, and by the exaggerated comments of our own newspapers upon them. Both gentlemen then proceed to expose and to denounce the monstrous logic of those who, because we had encountered terrible suffering and displayed much mismanagement at the commencement of a war undertaken after forty years of peace, jumped to the conclusion that the star of England was about to set for ever, and the not less rash inferences of those faithless liberals here, and those exulting reactionists abroad, who argued from the positive calamities of the British army, and a comparison of them with those suffered by the French, that a constitutional government could not carry on war successfully, and that free institutions were incompatible with, or unfavourable to, vigorous external action. M. de Rémusat, in particular, with great clearness and candour, explains the principal, though

by no means the sole, reason why, at the outset, the French troops in the Crimea were so much better provided than ourselves. He reminds both the premature desponders and the premature exulters that the characteristic of English warfare has never been prompt preparation, but indefatigable perseverance,—always failure at the commencement, redeemed by success at last; that, at the outset of a contest following a whole generation of tranquil inaction, inexperience in the leaders, and imperfection in the administrative departments of the army, were matters not to be wondered at, but to be expected; and that, besides this, we had been so long at peace as to have almost forgotten that war was inevitably a condition of hardship and of suffering, and we were therefore shocked and surprised at many things which, in truth, were only the constant differences between the life in barracks at home, and the life of camps during actual hostility.

‘Sans aucune jalousie et dans un esprit de bienveillante justice et de fraternité d’armes, les Anglais ont opposé à leur propre exemple l’exemple des Français. Nous n’avons nulle tentation de contester que l’épreuve de cette année ait été, aux yeux du monde, glorieuse pour nos chers soldats; nous disons même sincèrement que nous croyons aux Français plus d’aptitude naturelle à la guerre qu’aux Anglais, à la guerre bien entendu, non au combat: il n’y a point de troupes plus braves que les troupes Anglaises; mais faire la guerre n’est pas se battre seulement: c’est faire tous les métiers à la fois et les faire en hâte, au milieu de la confusion, du dénuement et du péril. C’est pour un soldat, remplacer au besoin le terrassier, le bûcheron, le maçon, le charpentier, le menuisier, le tailleur, le blanchisseur, le boucher, le cuisinier, le boulanger, sans avoir toujours les instruments et les matériaux de toutes ces professions; c’est vivre de privations et d’expédients. Laquelle des deux races est plus propre à ce genre d’industrie? Nous croyons le savoir, et nous rappellerons aux Anglais quelques circonstances particulières à notre pays, et qu’ils ne peuvent toutes nous envier. Toujours la France a dû se préoccuper des guerres d’invasion, c’est-à-dire qu’elle a été à toutes les époques exposée aux plus grandes opérations militaires que le temps comportât. . . . Enfin comment oublier que, militairement parlant, nous n’avons pas eu la paix, nous, depuis 1830? Nous avons eu en Algérie vingt ans de guerre au moins, parfois jusqu’à cent mille combattans. Et quelle guerre! la guerre dans le désert, un ennemi insaisissable et cruel, des embûches de toutes sortes, un pays stérile, un climat changeant, des lieux insalubres, des saisons meurtrières; toutes les souffrances, toutes les privations, toutes les difficultés ont aguerris les corps et les âmes et forcé toutes les intelligences à chercher par méthode ou par instinct tous les moyens de conserver la force, la santé, l’entrain, les vivres, les armes. Il n’y a point d’école supérieure à la guerre d’Afrique pour former les hommes aux vertus et aux talens individuels du soldat; il n’y en a

point qui ait plus appris aux chefs et aux administrateurs le devoir et l'art de veiller au physique et au moral des hommes et de leur rendre supportable le cruel labeur au prix duquel la gloire s'achète. Que la guerre se prolonge, et elle donnera aux troupes Anglaises ce qui peut leur manquer, ou plutôt elle le leur a déjà donné, et je suis sûr que les plaintes, fondées peut-être à la fin de 1854, ne le sont déjà plus à la fin de 1855.' (*Rémusat.*)

M. de Montalembert ventures on a similar prophecy.

'Quelle que soit la fortune de la guerre actuelle, on peut-être assuré que le peuple Anglais y mettra toute l'énergie, toute la persévérance que comportent son histoire et son caractère national, et de plus toute l'ardeur que développe la pratique des institutions libres. Il fera voir encore une fois, comme de 1792 à 1814, que la discussion, la critique, la publicité la plus illimitée, l'intervention quotidienne de la presse et de la tribune, l'usage et même l'abus de tous les droits, n'ôtent rien, chez un peuple vraiment digne d'être libre, à l'élasticité, à la vigueur, à la constance, qui sont les conditions et les garanties de la victoire.' (P. 16.)

How these generous and confident prophecies have been or would have been fulfilled, the admirable condition of efficiency and comfort of our Crimean army at the present moment, and our enormous preparations for the ensuing (and now unnecessary) campaign, sufficiently testify. We are only just now in a position fully and dispassionately to estimate the causes of our early disasters in the Crimea, both absolutely and relatively to those endured by our allies. These may be stated in a very few words. On the more perfect preparation of the French for every part of war except actual combat, we can add nothing to the lucid explanation just quoted from M. de Rémusat. It belongs to the different systems invariably pursued by the two nations;—to our military life in barracks, to their military life in camp;—to our insular, to their exposed position;—in part to the varying genius of the rivals and allies. Our army prepares for war when war begins: at other times it is, in a manner, laid up in ordinary; its preparation is therefore always behindhand; and it is only towards the third campaign that it arrives at perfection,—just as a phlegmatic, but powerful, racer or wrestler only gets into full wind about the time when his adversary is becoming out of breath. The French army, like our Indian army, is always ready because always on a war footing,—always in the active exercise of its profession. How truly this is the real explanation may be learned from a comparison of the relative condition of the two armies before Sebastopol at the present moment. We have got up to our full speed and strength: our allies are exhausted and suffering. Our troops are in possession of every conceivable comfort, and

in the best spirits and vigour: the French, we regret to say, have been enduring grievous privations, both in food and clothing. They have sometimes lost by disease and hardship 120 men a day; we, on an average, not *five* a week, and sometimes not one. In short, the relative conditions of the two allied forces in February, 1856, were precisely the reverse of what they were in February, 1855.

But this is not all. The sufferings and losses of the French have been far greater than was generally supposed. They concealed and extenuated the amount of their disasters: we proclaimed and exaggerated ours. The precise truth will, perhaps, never be generally known. But it is certain that we did not lose in all 25,000 men,—we understand not above 20,000: it is confessed that, in the same period, they lost 60,000 at least. Again, there is much reason to believe that had the relative *local* situation of the two armies before Sebastopol been reversed, their internal condition would have been in considerable measure reversed also. On landing in the Crimea, and at the battle of the Alma, the French army claimed the *right*, as being, in military tradition and fancy, ‘the post of honour:’ abutting on the sea, and being therefore protected and aided by the ships, it turned out to be the post of safety. But it was conceded to them, partly out of compliment, partly because we had cavalry and they had not; and we were therefore better fitted for an exposed position. But when the plan was changed, and the flank march made to the south of the beleaguered city, the French chose the *left* attack, and thus again found themselves nearest to the sea. Their camp was not two miles from their port: ours was seven. They had more than one port; and their principal one, Kamiesch, was much more open and accessible than Balaclava. They had several tracks over turf to their encampment, and when one was cut up they could make another by simply moving twenty or thirty yards to one side; we had but one possible path from Balaclava to the front (after the Woronzow road was closed to us by the Russian batteries), and this lay partly through a gorge, and partly through what, in fine weather, was an impalpable dust, and what, in wet weather, became an impracticable morass,—varying, in fact, as the roads about Cheltenham are said to do, between powder and pomatum. That, in many respects, our allies managed far better at first than we did, there can be no question: that it was made *possible* for them to do so by their position is equally unquestionable; that much of our misery was unavoidable by any skill, is now clear to all who have been in the Crimea. When we failed or omitted to take Sebastopol by a *coup-de-main*;

when the surprise, which we designed, was exchanged for a siege, which we had not contemplated; when the result of the bombardment of the 17th of October showed what a long and difficult and unexpected task lay before us; when it became certain that we must winter in the trenches; and when the inadequacy of Balaclava for the requirements of an army such as ours was perceived, and the fact that it was the *only* available landing-place on that rocky coast was known, — it became obvious to every eye that terrible difficulties and sufferings were at hand. *Then*, every effort was made by every body, — but preparations began when the things to be prepared were wanted on the instant. The work to be done was greater than the means to do it. Our harbour-space was inadequate; the season was exceptional; what was a hard, dry road at night, was a deep swamp by morning; hurricane and cholera were added to our calamities; every thing came upon the unhappy authorities at once, and every misfortune reacted upon, and aggravated, every other. It is painful to look back upon such scenes. They are full of matter for grief, for warning, for blame, — but for gratitude and encouragement likewise. Thus much remains unquestionable: no army ever bore such miseries so nobly; no nation ever made such generous and gigantic efforts to relieve them; and no disasters were ever surmounted and retrieved so rapidly and so entirely. Within six months the troops passed from the intensity of suffering and privation to the height of efficiency and comfort.

The time is not yet arrived when it is possible to enter upon a really critical examination of the military operations, and the military administration, of the two allied armies in the Crimea; nor do we now allude to the subject for the invidious purpose of drawing any contrast between them. On the contrary, the exploits of the French troops have been celebrated with as much enthusiasm in this country as those of our own soldiers; and the glory they won on the same fields was bestowed on both armies in the same ungrudging spirit. But justice to the memory of those who are no more leads us to take the earliest opportunity of recording in this place a few facts connected with Lord Raglan's part in these operations, which will be confirmed when the history of the campaign is more accurately written.* As the commander-in-chief of an

* A most incorrect and bombastic narrative of the Crimean Expedition has just been published in Paris by a Baron de Bazancourt, sent out, it seems, by the Minister of Public Instruction; but as a contribution to history it is entirely worthless; it treats the British

army in difficulties Lord Raglan's administrative abilities may justly be censured; but on the field of battle he showed a quickness of eye and a vigour of judgment which have not been equalled by any officer engaged in the late war. It was Lord Raglan who, immediately after the battle of the Alma, urged the necessity of instantly pursuing the flying enemy; but the English *aide-de-camp* who was despatched with this message to Marshal St. Arnaud found that brave officer struggling with the anguish of pain and approaching death. An answer was given that the troops were too fatigued to advance that evening; and when this great opportunity had been lost, Lord Raglan himself resolved not to move till his wounded were in safety. Lord Raglan intended to follow up the first bombardment of the town on the 17th October by an assault, but this plan was defeated by the explosion and destruction of the French batteries, and by the peremptory refusal of General Canrobert to attack the place. When the Russian army was in full and disorderly retreat after the failure of the combined attack at Inkermann, Lord Raglan conjured General Canrobert to bring up the right wing of the French army, in order to pursue the enemy and complete his destruction. In spite of the earnest entreaties and representations of his colleague, the French commander-in-chief declined to take the responsibility of giving this order; and it is due to the high character of General Canrobert to add, that he has since been heard to express his regret that he did not make the movement which Lord Raglan proposed. Even in the last charge at Inkermann, General Canrobert had insisted that the Guards, broken as they were, should advance with the French columns, saying, 'Les Zouaves feront mieux s'ils voient les *Black Caps*.' Again, the expedition to Kertch was planned by Lord Raglan and Sir Edmund Lyons; the consent of the French general was reluctantly given; once the troops were actually recalled and disembarked; and the great success which attended that movement was, in a manner, forced on our allies. Lastly, we venture to affirm that had either Marshal St. Arnaud or Lord Raglan lived to witness the termination of the great enterprise they had begun twelve months before, the victory of the 8th September would not have stopped where it did, and that the blow, which only needed an eye and a hand to direct it, would

army in the East with ludicrous unfairness; it dresses up every achievement of the French with fantastic partiality; and we have heard it loudly condemned and repudiated by many of the most eminent officers in the army of our gallant allies.

have been struck home. It is a mistake to suppose that the British army and the British generals were not in a condition to bear their full part in all the great operations of the war, and the disparaging opinion which may be entertained of our forces on the Continent is mainly due to the misrepresentations which have been circulated by ourselves.

Both M. de Rémusat and M. de Montalembert trample upon the shallow reasoning and baseless fallacies of those who infer from the administrative superiority of the French army at the commencement of the war, that a constitutional government is necessarily incapable of equalling a despotic one in military enterprises. 'Il n'est pas vrai,' says the former:—

'Il n'est pas vrai — que les Anglais se gardent de le croire, la perfidie tenterait seule de la leur persuader,—non, il n'est pas vrai que le système constitutionnel soit un obstacle à la bonne tenue, à l'habile entretien, à l'éducation guerrière d'une grande armée. Toutes nos institutions militaires, pénétrées de l'esprit de la révolution Française, se sont développées, perfectionnées, fixées sous ce gouvernement. Jamais chez nous l'intérêt de l'armée n'a été pris plus à cœur que depuis trente ans, et l'on ne persuadera qu'à des sots ou à des valets que la liberté politique n'allume point le foyer du patriotisme et de l'honneur. J'ajouterai, car je suis décidé à tout dire, que le caractère et la politique des princes de la maison d'Orléans les portaient à s'occuper de l'armée avec une sollicitude ardente et à vivre de la même vie qu'elle.' (*Rémusat*).

Doubtless freer governments are *slower* machines than absolute ones; and a centralised despotism, wielded by the vigorous will of a single man, can almost always bring its resources to bear more promptly than a constitutional monarchy or a republic. Hence the resources of the former—being more readily available—will always appear greater than they really are, while those of the former will appear smaller. But not only is this effect apparent merely; it is apparent even only for a time. The more prolonged the struggle and the race, the more obvious and the more indisputable does the solid strength of nations, whose force is freedom, stand forth in all history. Their ultimate *means* are incalculably vaster, though more slowly and heavily brought into play. The one is a warehouse, making little show outside, but crammed with stores from the cellar to the garret; the other is a shop, gorgeous and inviting, but with all its wealth displayed in the window and on the counter. In the third year of the war, England—clumsy, constitutional, almost democratic, but opulent even to plethora—is only just warming to her work, is prepared to take the field both by sea and land on a scale of magnitude as yet unparalleled, is in immeasurably better condition for the strife than at the outset,

bears enormous taxes without grumbling or inconvenience, can obtain any amount of money she may need at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and is about to sheathe the sword with undisguised reluctance and only in obedience to the dictates of humanity and friendship. At the same moment our autocratic ally and our despotic adversary are alike breathless and bleeding, — one in a state of utter impoverishment and exhaustion, and the other deplorably embarrassed in her finances, and looking with the gravest anxiety on the burdens, present and prospective, imposed upon her by the exertions she has made in the common cause — burdens which we scarcely feel, exertions which we made with ease.

While confuting and ridiculing with a just contempt the men who have drawn such strange inferences as to England's future from disasters and mistakes which might so naturally have been anticipated, and which have been so speedily and nobly redeemed, neither M. de Rémusat nor M. de Montalembert are blind to the symptoms in our body politic, which few even among ourselves can view without uneasiness. These writers discern shrewdly and expound clearly both our safeguards and our dangers — both the reasons which make alarmists fancy that we are on the road to ruin, and the reasons which satisfy them that we are not. In their opinion the principal peril which menaces our freedom and our grandeur is our increasing tendency towards democracy on the one hand and bureaucracy on the other. It is natural that intelligent Frenchmen, ardently attached to those liberal institutions which have so often — but always transiently — been submerged in France, should view with perhaps exaggerated alarm the first faint risings here of the flood which has overwhelmed freedom on the Continent; but their warnings are well worthy of grave attention. The danger may be yet far off; we may still have far to travel in the direction of a development of popular influence and a systematic reorganisation of our administrative departments, before we reach the point at which desirable amendment ceases, and perilous innovation begins; but we cannot deny the truth of M. de Montalembert's prognosis. Our face is set towards those two quarters; our movement, slow and tentative though it be, is in those directions; and no people are so well qualified as Frenchmen, both by close and long study, and by bitter and humiliating experience, to teach us that democracy and bureaucracy are in modern times the two most imminent and insidious foes of genuine freedom; that the hidden sympathy between them is easily developed into a fast alliance; and that both become, with alarming facility of transition, the auxiliaries and instru-

ments of despotism.* There is something almost touching in the generous and solemn earnestness with which these sufferers, who have succumbed to a malady which they see about to attack us, warn us against its faintest symptoms and its earliest approaches. They know well that that 'false democracy'—whose most invariable features are impatience under public calamity and suspicion of public virtue; unqualified detestation of whatever can resist its pressure, and is independent of its control†—is the most fatal enemy, as it is the wretched counterfeit, of that rational and sober devotion to popular right which recognises in reverence for the ancient and the noble the counterpart and complement of a passion for the truly free, and finds in a stable social hierarchy the surest bulwark against tyrannous violence, whether from above or from below; and they are grieved to see among us a class who are worshipping the false god and propagating the pestilential creed. They have learned, to their cost, that throughout the Continent, as well as especially in France, a centralised army of functionaries is the very sword and shield—the very right-hand and right-eye—of despotism, by a double operation, by oppression and corruption equally: first, by providing it with a body of skilfully trained and marshalled instruments, disciplined to systematic obedience and executive routine, and benumbed by official habitudes; and secondly, by stimulating and propagating that passion for salaries and government employment, which saps all national spirit of independence, and makes of a whole people a mere crowd of servile

* At this very moment an example has occurred which demonstrates, in the most striking manner, what the political state of France actually is, and what a government still laying claim to the support of universal suffrage may become. It has just been decided by the Court of Cassation (26th March, 1856), under the presidency of M. Troplong, and in opposition to the judgments of two inferior Courts, that the distribution of lists of candidates at the municipal elections, not being authorized by the government, *is a misdemeanour*, or, in other words, that it is a punishable offence to promote the election of any man not known as a nominee of the Executive Power! So that the form of election by universal suffrage is kept up, but the candidates to whom the suffrage of the nation can be given must be approved by the bureaucratic agents of the Government.

† 'C'est le propre de la mauvaise démocratie de ne pas savoir supporter l'adversité; et le premier symptôme des envahissements de l'esprit de désordre qui aboutit à l'abdication et à l'asservissement des grandes nations, c'est de ne savoir expliquer que par la trahison ou l'incapacité des chances nécessairement variables de la guerre. L'Angleterre s'est donc laissée entamer, l'hiver dernier, par l'une des infirmités radicales de la démocratie.' (*Montalembert*, p. 42.)

solicitors for place. And in the recent cry for administrative reform and a reorganisation of the civil service—in the increased number of posts at the disposal of the Crown, and in the demand that these shall be open to all aspirants, as well as in the tendency to substitute paid for unpaid service—they think they recognise a distant approximation to what has proved so fatal to themselves.* After describing that true popular liberty whose progress we all rejoice in, M. de Montalembert proceeds:—

‘Mais il y a une autre démocratie, haineuse, jalouse, furieuse, fille de l’envie, que Bossuet a si bien définie *le noir et secret effet d’un orgueil faible*. Son génie consiste surtout à contester et à détruire toutes les supériorités qui sortent de la nature des choses, telle que la vie historique des peuples les constitue et les proclame. Elle est l’ennemie de tout ce qui dure, de tout ce qui résiste, de tout ce qui grandit. Elle nie tous les progrès graduels de la liberté : elle insulte tous ses alliés naturels ; elle poursuit surtout d’une implacable ingratitude les princes qui l’ont donnée ou servie. Elle fait de la vie des nations un orage perpétuel ; elle les réduit à chercher éperdues un refuge dans le premier port venu, et à s’y donner pour servantes ou pour otages à celui qui les sauvera du naufrage.

‘Grâce au Ciel et pour l’honneur de l’humanité, ce n’est pas la seule démocratie que l’on puisse concevoir, que l’on ait connue dans ce monde ; mais c’est, hélas ! la seule dont les démocrates modernes du continent aient su établir le règne pendant les courts instants de leur victoire. Avec eux, ce n’est pas la démocratie libérale, c’est la démocratie unitaire qui a vaincu. Aussi ne peut-elle servir qu’à frayer la route à l’unité du despotisme. Et quand l’œuvre est consommée, n’a-t-on pas toujours vu la démocratie révolutionnaire se consoler de ses affronts et de ses mécomptes en se raccrochant aux triomphes de la force et en les exploitant ? Ne s’entend-elle pas toujours avec la monarchie absolue, telle que l’esprit moderne la conçoit et l’admet, pour proscrire partout la vraie liberté, tantôt comme une aristocratie, tantôt comme une conspiration ? N’ont-elles pas l’une et l’autre une égale horreur de tout ce qui se tient debout, de tout ce qui vit par soi-même ? N’ont-elles pas l’une comme l’autre substitué partout des liens mécaniques, artificiels, éphémères, aux garanties morales, naturelles, traditionnelles, et condamné partout la valeur et la dignité individuelle de l’homme à être absorbées par l’état ? Ne pratiquent-elles pas à l’envi l’ostracisme contre la capacité, le courage et la droiture ? N’ont-elles pas pour principe commun la répudiation du seul gouvernement vraiment légitime et naturel, celui des hommes

* ‘Mais la passion des places se serait-elle développée dans le pays, ou veut-on l’y introduire ? On se plaint que ces emplois ne soient pas assez recherchés, et l’on voudrait en augmenter l’éclat et le profit pour les rendre plus dignes de l’ambition du talent. Dieu préserve l’Angleterre d’une révolution administrative qui deviendrait ainsi une révolution sociale ! Dieu conserve à ce noble pays le premier des biens, l’indépendance individuelle.’ (Rémusat, p. 280.)

supérieurs par la position, le caractère, le talent? N'invoquent-elles pas toutes deux comme raison suprême l'ascendant exclusif du nombre, c'est-à-dire le droit du plus fort dans ce qu'il y a de plus aveugle et de plus brutal?' (*Montalembert*, p. 32.)

Not less deserving our attention is the following warning against the dangers of an incipient bureaucracy:—

‘L'extension de l'éducation chez les masses, en déclassant une foule d'individus, a créé une foule d'aspirants à la bureaucratie, et d'un autre côté les progrès lents mais incontestables de la centralisation administrative a augmenté le nombre de places à donner. La demande est et sera toujours très-supérieure à l'offre; mais l'une et l'autre se sont accrues.

‘C'est là le plus grand péril de la société anglaise; le mal est loin d'être aussi grand que chez les nations du continent, mais l'Angleterre est déjà sur la pente fatale. Il est temps pour ses hommes d'état de reconnaître que le désir universel et immodéré des emplois publics est la pire des maladies sociales. Elle répand dans tout le corps de la nation une humeur vénale et servile qui n'exclut nullement, même chez les mieux pourvus, l'esprit de faction et d'anarchie. Elle crée une foule d'affamés capable de toutes les fureurs pour satisfaire leur appétit, et propres à toutes les bassesses dès qu'ils sont rassasiés. Un peuple de solliciteurs est le dernier des peuples. Il n'y a pas d'ignominie par où on ne puisse le faire passer.

‘La véritable réforme administrative consisterait donc à réprimer énergiquement la tendance démocratique qui multiplie les emplois, qui fait remplir par des agents salariés, nommés et révoqués au gré du gouvernement, les fonctions naguère gratuites, inamovibles ou électives; qui augmente indénniment la responsabilité du pouvoir, et qui finit par l'accabler sous le poids des cupidités impatientes, des rancunes implacables, et des dévouements impuissants. Tous les Anglais dévoués à la grandeur de leur pays devraient se liguier pour refouler ce flot continental de la bureaucratie qui mine peu à peu ses antiques institutions, et qui finira par engloutir sa prospérité, sa liberté et sa gloire.’ (*De l'Avenir*, p. 74.)

After discussing the dangers to which England is exposed, M. de Montalembert, with equal sagacity, lays his finger on our safeguards, — on those peculiarities in our institutions and our character which in his judgment will suffice to preserve us from that shipwreck which our enemies augur for us, and to guarantee us a national career as glorious in the future as in the past — equally long, noble, beneficent, and free. He enumerates many of these happy securities, the principal being the unusual constitution of our aristocracy, the singular characteristics which distinguish the education of our upper classes from that of other countries, and our no less distinctive love of ‘fair play’ and respect for the rights of others.

The chapter entitled ‘Ce qu'il reste d'Aristocratie en Angle-
VOL. CIII. NO. CCX. P P

terre,' is perhaps the most interesting and philosophic in the volume, and shows more than any other how thoroughly M. de Montalembert knows us, how cordially he appreciates our advantages, and how generously he admires our character. He points out that the nobility of England never — as in most countries — formed a class apart from or opposed to the other classes of society. A perpetual flux and reflux is for ever going on between the aristocracy and the gentry and even the ranks below the gentry ; and this process has continued for centuries, till the blending is entire and unique. Unlike all other feudal aristocracies, with us only the eldest son inherits the nobility of his father ; the younger branches mingle with the community at large, separated from them by no privileges, and only occasionally and for one generation distinguishable by mere titles of courtesy. At the same time, other individuals are daily rising from the mass of the people and making their way into the ranks of the nobility by civil services, by military distinction, by political success, by legal eminence, or even sometimes by means of wealth honourably acquired by enterprise or commerce. The same ceaseless blending and renewal is promoted by another operation. Intermarriages between opulent commoners and the poorer nobles are frequent, and by no means regarded with disapproval. It is curious, as remarked by our author, that we have no words in our language equivalent to the French expressions *mésalliance* and *parvenu* : the ideas are foreign to our feelings and modes of thought. By the operation of this constant fusion we preserve at once the freshness and vigour of our noble races, and their harmony of sentiment and character with those below them. The same result is aided by another circumstance almost equally peculiar to England — the existence namely of the class of *gentry** — a most extensive and influential body, without boundary, and defying definition — whose ranks any possessing property and education may enter at will and unobserved ; and

* ' C'est ainsi que se forment, à l'ombre du foyer paternel, sous les arbres plantés par les ancêtres, ces vies calmes et inflexibles, ces races nobles et pures, qui se personnifient dans le *country-gentleman*, le *ciris agricola* de l'Angleterre. C'est là qu'il apprend cette sereine fierté, cette indépendance respectueuse et satisfaite, cette attitude qui n'est ni rogue ni servile, dont il offre le modèle. C'est là que se développe le tranquille sentiment du bien-être assuré, qui fait le fondement du repos des états ; le bonheur d'être à sa place, de tenir son rang, parceque ce rang est suffisamment garanti contre la mobilité des choses humaines, contre cette *proximité perpétuelle du néant qui menace les existences sociales sous les pouvoirs absolus et sous les démocraties.*' (P. 109.)

many of whose members rival even the peers of the realm in territorial wealth and political importance, and often surpass them in the length and distinction of their pedigree. Thus the English aristocracy presents the singular anomaly of being more energetic, more wealthy, and more powerful than any other, while it is more easily accessible to merit of every kind; and at the same time more entirely destitute of all obnoxious or oppressive privileges. Therefore it is that in this country we have never had either a Jacquerie or any of the feelings which could lead to such a catastrophe.

‘Mais ce qui est sûr, c’est que depuis les grandes révoltes qui se personnifièrent dans Wat Tyler et Jack Cade, au XIV^e. et au XV^e. siècle, on ne voit dans l’histoire de l’Angleterre aucune trace de soulèvement des classes inférieures contre les classes élevées. Ce qui est sûr, c’est que pendant que la noblesse française, après avoir sacrifié à la royauté sa dignité et son indépendance, s’obstinait à maintenir tout cet édifice oppressif et suranné qui s’écroula dans la nuit du 4 août 1789, la noblesse anglaise, la “gentry” avait, deux cents ans auparavant, délivré les paysans, en se délivrant elle-même, du joug de ces anachronismes mortels. Qu’en est-il résulté? C’est que, l’Angleterre ayant fait sa révolution un siècle et demi avant nous, quand le Parlement entama contre la royauté cette insurrection qui aboutit à une république temporaire, on vit non seulement des seigneurs de la plus haute noblesse à la tête des armées parlementaires, mais les paysans combattre avec les seigneurs et pour eux. Nulle part ne se manifesta un mouvement populaire contre l’aristocratie, contre ses propriétés et ses droits. Privée pour un temps de sa représentation officielle par la suppression de la Chambre des Pairs, elle conserva tout son ascendant sur le cœur du peuple. Les “Cavaliers” restèrent dans leurs terres, entourés de la confiance et de la vénération de leurs voisins et dépendants. Et pourquoi? parce que dès-lors et bien auparavant il n’y avait plus en Angleterre ni serfs, ni vassaux, ni corvéables. Aucun Anglais n’était le sujet ni l’inférieur légal d’un autre Anglais; aucune terre n’était grevée de redevances oppressives; aucune industrie n’était astreinte à d’humiliantes restrictions.

‘Voilà où éclate, à mon sens, l’immense supériorité de l’aristocratie anglaise! Voilà le fondement légitime de son empire! Que d’autres vantent sa splendeur, son habileté, le courage, l’éloquence, le génie politique de ses enfants: ils auront raison. Mais quant à moi, je veux surtout la louer et la bénir d’avoir su écouter, avant tout le reste de l’Europe, la voix de la justice envers ses inférieurs, d’en avoir pratiqué les lois sans y être forcée par une insurrection ou par un despote, et avec si peu de fracas et d’étalage que l’on peut à peine retrouver dans l’histoire la trace d’une si prodigieuse et si bienfaisante révolution.’ (P. 92.)

We have the less cause to fear in England that class warfare which has proved so fatal to the peace and the liberty and the

progress of more than one continental nation, because, in addition to the peculiar constitution of our aristocracy which we have just spoken of, it has, for a long period, been oftener divided against itself than arrayed in opposition to other classes,—and this both on political and social questions. All popular movements have been headed by a portion of the nobles. In all the great struggles which have convulsed the state a considerable section of the aristocracy embraced the democratic side. Our peers have been constantly the advocates, as well as the opponents, of the liberties and wishes of the people. It was so in the seventeenth century, when the armies of the Parliament were led by earls and viscounts. It has been so in the nineteenth century, when on the Reform Bill and the Corn Law Question, the Lords were just as much opposed to one another as the Commons. There is no popular grievance of which some noble senator cannot be found to make himself the spokesman. There is no popular demand—in the least rational—that cannot ensure supporters among the first families in the land. Nor is there any likelihood that the aristocracy and the people will ever be opposed *as classes*, unless one class or other should become so wholly unreasonable and unjust that its discomfiture will be certain, easy, and ‘a consummation devoutly to be wished.’ M. Guizot remarked, when he was driven to this country in 1848 by the Revolution, that the safeguard of England lay in an aristocracy without arrogance and a people without envy. The 10th of April showed how all classes will combine for a common interest.

‘J’aperçois donc toujours (says our author) quelque aristocrate, quelque oligarque, au premier rang des auteurs ou des auxiliaires de tout mouvement utile, ou simplement nouveau. En général ils sont jeunes, mais pas toujours : quelquefois ce rôle est disputé aux débutants de l’aristocratie par un ministre disgracié, un viceroy émérite, un chancelier en retraite, ou un duc dans la plénitude de l’âge et de la fortune. Mais on peut-être sûr qu’il se trouvera toujours quelque homme d’un grand nom ou d’une grande existence à la tête de toutes les questions de l’avenir.’ (P. 61.)

M. de Montalembert is, as might be expected, much struck with another feature in the conduct of our aristocracy, both titled and untitled, which can be seen, we believe, nowhere else. We refer to the deep solicitude and active concern shown by many among them, especially by the younger members of some of the noblest families, in all questions bearing on the improvement and comforts of the lower classes,—an interest alike honourable to themselves and of good augury for their country’s welfare,—an interest which proves how fully they are awake

to the surpassing magnitude of these questions in the social transformations which are gradually going on among us, and to the solemn obligations laid upon them by their lofty position and their ancestral names.

With what eyes M. de Montalembert—alive as he is to the stability and independence inherent in the hereditary principle—has looked upon the recently meditated modification of that principle by the introduction of life-peerages, we need hardly inquire. The fate of Lord Wensleydale is not encouraging either to the givers or to the acceptors of such honours, and we sincerely hope that eminent Judge may soon be placed among the hereditary peers of England. But whatever may be the objections to life peerages, nothing could be easier than to devise limitations and conditions which should restrain the prerogative from the possibility of abuse for political purposes. Nothing can be more futile than the fear that in these days of complete publicity and popular opinion, any such abuse should be attempted or carried to a serious extent. Two centuries ago, the question might have been one of grave and practical constitutional importance: now its interest, as one of prerogative *versus* liberty, is purely speculative. One consideration connected with it, however, appears to have been misconceived, or to have escaped notice. Some persons of extreme democratic views were disposed to hail, in the attempted introduction of life-peerages, an approach towards, what they term, reform of the House of Lords—a step calculated, as was supposed, to bring it more in harmony with the prevailing feelings and opinions of the nation. They have an impression that a Chamber of hereditary peers is necessarily more conservative and anti-popular, than a Chamber of life-peers would be. It may be so, occasionally and partially. But those who reason thus, overlook one weighty counterbalancing consideration. There is the conservatism of temperament, as well as that of property. Age, as well as rank and long descent, is opposed to innovation and to progress. Now a Chamber of created peers will almost exclusively be composed of old men: it will naturally consist of those who have risen to distinction, or who are men of weight by character, fame, or position, and will as a rule therefore be past middle life, will have survived enthusiasm and have seen through those delusive expectations from which most popular reforms take their rise and derive their attractiveness. An hereditary Chamber will always contain a large proportion of young nobles, full of hope, robust in faith, sanguine of amelioration, prompt to experiment, and generous in mood.

Such a Chamber can never be wholly obstructive: many of its members will be certain to sympathise with popular notions, and to embrace the popular cause. M. de Montalembert's own case offers a curious illustration of this remark. He was the last peer of France who attained his majority, and took his seat in the upper Chamber, when the hereditary peerage was abolished. The peers nominated by Louis Philippe were of course the celebrities of the country, and therefore no longer young. Gradually, therefore, M. de Montalembert—always the youngest man in the Chamber—found himself one of the very few young members it contained, and from this cause, as well as from his enthusiastic temperament and his democratic sympathies, in constant and increasing opposition to the great mass of his colleagues. The hereditary Chamber of Peers in France under the Restoration was in all respects a more important and a more liberal body than that which was composed of Louis Philippe's nominees; and Lord Lyndhurst was right when he reckoned the destruction of the hereditary peerage in that country as the sure precursor of the destruction of the constitutional monarchy.

The public education of the youth of England, contrasted with that customary in France, is in the eyes of M. de Montalembert, one of our most signal advantages, and one of the surest guarantees of our national liberty and strength. He notices especially two peculiarities:—the first, that nearly all our public schools, and both the old universities, are situated in the country, and not, as in other countries, in the heart of great cities;—the second that, whereas in France the boy at school is *surveillé* like a baby every minute of his time, and has actually no freedom of individual action whatever, yet the moment he passes from school to college, is liberated from all restraint and thrown without check or guide upon his own untrained powers of self-control, amid all the concurring temptations of youth, liberty, and Paris,—in this country the extraordinary amount of freedom allowed at Eton, Winchester, Rugby, and Harrow, early habituates the boy to self-government and self-defence, while his college career is still surrounded with limitations and superintendence, which continue the discipline of education till actual life begins. The French system teaches the boy to hate control, and surrenders the youth to boundless license: ours early accustoms him to moderate freedom, but never abandons him to absolute lawlessness.

‘Je ne dirai qu’un mot des étudiants; ce sera pour relever un contraste nouveau et significatif entre eux et les nôtres. Les nôtres sortent brusquement de la servitude des lycées, où chaque minute de

leur journée est réglementée sur un échantillon commun à la France entière, pour entrer dans la liberté absolue de la vie de jeune homme à Paris. Dès que notre lycéen est transformé en étudiant, nul ne surveille ni sa conduite ni ses études ; il loge où il veut, et fait tout ce qu'il veut du matin au soir et du soir au matin. L'étudiant anglais sort d'une école comme Eton, où il a déjà goûté l'attrait et la responsabilité de la liberté, pour retrouver à Oxford ou à Cambridge une discipline presque aussi sévère que celle qu'il a suivie pendant son enfance. Il peut disposer de sa journée, mais à la condition d'assister deux fois par jour à l'office divin, et de ne jamais sortir dans la rue sans le costume officiel, une robe noire avec un bonnet carré. En outre, tout étudiant doit loger dans un des collèges de l'Université : il y occupe un appartement particulier, mais il faut qu'il dîne au réfectoire commun avec ses camarades et ses maîtres, et que le soir il soit rentré à heure fixe. Toute contravention grave à ces lois, tout outrage constaté à la régularité des mœurs ou simplement aux usages du monde poli, entraîne soit l'expulsion de l'Université, soit la *rustication*, c'est-à-dire un exil de trois mois, qui équivaut par la perte des frais d'inscription, etc., à une amende de 1,000 à 1,200 fr., infligée à la famille du délinquant. Tel est le régime que subit, sans l'ombre d'un murmure, l'élite de la jeunesse anglaise de dix-huit à vingt-deux ans, et qui leur apprend le respect de soi en même temps que le respect de la loi et de la tradition.' (P. 157.)

The next saving feature in the political aspect of England on which M. de Montalembert dwells, is our moral courage and that tolerance of contradiction, that respect for individual independence and for the opinions of others, which renders this moral courage a virtue within the reach of ordinary minds. Here, more than anywhere else, is 'the tyranny of the majority' unknown. Here public men are never martyred and rarely ostracised for their opinions. Nowhere are sentences of exile from public favour so cautiously passed or so speedily rescinded. Nowhere is lost popularity so easily recovered. It therefore requires no extraordinary amount of conscientiousness or nerve in a politician to stand up boldly for his own views against opposition, and to stem the tide of national desire. He knows, in the first place, that he will have to face nothing worse than non-attention in Parliament, abuse or sarcasm in the press, murmurs and perhaps hissings on the hustings. He knows, too, that if he be firm and rational his day will soon come round, and his antagonism to the popular passion of the day be forgotten or forgiven. He knows, further, that he will be all the more respected for his courage and tenacity, if he has mingled them with no insolence or bitterness ; and will be pardoned if he has. In truth, of all publics, the British public is the most placable, the most patient of opposition, the most

idolatrous of *pluck*. The moment a statesman is effectually discomfited and driven from power we pass an act of indemnity and oblivion for all his offences. The moment he makes a fine speech, or does a gallant action, or heads a popular demand, we incontinently restore him to favour. How many of our leading statesmen have not done or said things which it was thought must deprive them of public confidence irretrievably and for ever banish them from power ! yet, in a few years or a few months, they re-appear at the surface, smiling, whitewashed, pardoned, and popular, — their attainders reversed, their honours and emoluments restored.

The advantages of this national peculiarity are incalculable. It ensures to every question a full and searching discussion. It ensures to the people the certainty of hearing the truth, however unpopular that truth may at the moment be. It ensures a stubborn opposition to every popular prejudice and passion. It makes apostacy infamous, because indicative either of excessive cowardice or of palpable corruptibility. It renders civil courage a comparatively common virtue by rendering it a comparatively easy one. It secures, too, the existence of constant barriers against the preponderance of every sort of power. No one who has watched the evil consequences of the absence of this insular excellence in France and in America will underrate its value. It is not too much to say that where it is not, liberty cannot long be.

‘Quiconque a entendu le mémorable discours de M. Gladstone contre la prolongation de la guerre dans la séance du 24 mai dernier, aurait pu croire que la majorité ou au moins une portion très-considérable de la chambre des communes partageait l’opinion de l’orateur, tant le silence était profond, l’attention soutenue, l’approbation de ses amis incontestée : et cependant il n’y avait peut-être pas trente membres de son avis sur cinq cents, et l’opinion du dehors ainsi que la presse tout entière étaient unanimes à le combattre. Il en a été de même quand M. Cobden et M. Bright ont développées leurs théories de la paix à tout prix. . . . Ceux qui ont passé par nos assemblées politiques et qui ont eu à y lutter contre l’intolérance successive ou simultanée des majorités et des minorités, sont à même d’apprécier le bienfait de tels procédés.

‘C’est que le peuple anglais, qui a l’instinct et le goût du courage civil, reconnaît et admire cette vertu chez tout homme qui ose résister isolément à l’ascendant des idées dominantes, au flot de l’opinion. Même quand on contredit le plus directement ses passions et ses préjugés, il se contente de l’impuissance de ses contradicteurs ; et loin de vouloir les bâillonner, il sent que la résolution et la ténacité de ces individualités énergiques sont une gloire et une force de plus pour le caractère national. Il semble qu’il n’y a au fond rien de plus anti-démocratique que ces résistances individuelles à la volonté de la

foûle. On n'en voit guère plus de traces dans la république des États-Unis que dans les monarchies absolues de l'Europe. Dans les démocraties on est toujours tenté de regarder comme une offense à l'égalité, comme le *ne plus ultra* du privilège, l'audace de celui qui se détache en relief sur le fond uniforme de l'assentiment universel. En effet c'est le comble de l'aristocratie que d'oser ainsi tenir tête à ce que la divinité du jour exige, que de remonter le torrent qui se précipite sur sa pente, et de rester seul debout quand tous se prosternent ou se cachent. Mais rien ne s'oppose à ce que cette énergie d'une conscience invincible se retrouve au sein d'une démocratie chrétienne et sincèrement libérale.' (P. 232.)

The last point noticed by M. de Montalembert, and on which we can echo his sentiments to the very letter, is the extent to which the voluntary action of individuals, singly and in association, supersedes and completes the action of the government — a political phenomenon of singular significance, so characteristic of England, so little known in France. In France the constituted authorities do everything: unaccredited citizens do nothing. Each man looks after his own private affairs, but does even this under a species of surveillance and constraint: with the law he 'has nothing to do but to obey it;' with the government he has nothing to do but to submit to it, or to conspire against it. Here 'the public business of England is 'the private business of every Englishman;' as citizen, as special constable, as vestryman, jurymen, magistrate, orator at public meetings, committee-man in societies for the promotion of philanthropic objects, social improvements, or national enterprise, nearly every individual above the labouring class is virtually an active member of the administration of his country.

' Là nul gouvernement n'a encore imaginé de se substituer à l'action collective ou individuelle des citoyens, de comprimer partout la force spontanée, la volonté responsable, de vouloir tout subordonner à son initiative, à sa correction, à son autorisation, à sa surveillance, à son intervention, à son intérêt personnel. Bien loin de céder à ces tentatives à l'empiétement universel qui a fait la force apparente et la faiblesse réelle de tous les pouvoirs dont la France a successivement subi les lois, le gouvernement anglais ne se mêle qu'à son corps défendant de tout ce qui n'est pas du domaine de la politique proprement dite. Il est poussé dans cette voie par l'esprit démocratique et radical, par l'aveuglement suranné de quelques libéraux, mais il n'y marche qu'à pas de tortue.

' Ce concours de tous à l'œuvre commune n'est pas seulement la base de la vie politique, c'est la base fondamentale de toute l'organisation sociale. La lutte, le travail, l'activité indépendante et spontanée, sont partout. Il en résulte, au premier abord, une certaine apparence de confusion et de désordre. Elle frappe et étonne ceux qui arrivent des pays où tout est arrangé, casé, étiqueté, selon

les règles de cette fatigante uniformité et de cette minutieuse sollicitude de l'autorité qui *évitte à l'honnête homme tout dérangement, en le déchargeant de toute responsabilité*, mais qui tue l'esprit de dévouement et de sacrifice, qui énerve la race des peuples modernes et les condamne à une minorité perpétuelle. Ils ne savent s'émanciper de la tutelle d'un maître que pour se précipiter dans une orgie anarchique : après quoi, éperdus, étourdis, épuisés par un effort violent et court, ils deviennent la proie du premier audacieux qui leur offre le joug accoutumé, en attendant que la démagogie revienne, *et ne retrouve en face d'elle que des hommes déshabitués de toute action civile et libre et endormis dans une léthargie chronique.*' (P. 241.)

M. de Montalembert omits to notice the price we pay for this individual intervention in all political affairs — a price not, perhaps, too high for the national vigilance and energy which it develops and keeps up, but still a price unquestionably severe. An amateur administration is necessarily clumsy and unscientific, and often costly. Indeed, in nearly everything our French critic sees us in our brightest colours. He does not remind us that we are easy victims to the failures of administrators whom we do not pay, and to the jobs and short-comings of an aristocracy which, on the whole, we respect and love. In short, he contents himself with pointing out to his countrymen the perennial sources of our liberty and our strength which he would have them admire and emulate, and leaves to ourselves the more ungracious but not less salutary task of discovering and correcting the errors by which this strength is often wasted and this liberty sometimes tarnished and imperilled. No doubt this highflown and almost unbroken strain of eulogy on the institutions of England is mainly intended by its author, and understood by his readers, to be a satire on the existing institutions of France ; and we know not how much we are indebted for all this courtesy to the rancour of M. de Montalembert against a government which he certainly helped to establish in his own country. This remark serves to explain much that is very highly coloured in these pages, and the writer is obviously very often indifferent to the accuracy of his statements provided they hit his object. But we have a more serious cause of complaint against Count Montalembert in that cloud of bigotry and religious intolerance which perpetually surrounds him. What are we to think of the penetration or the sincerity of a man who professes to study and admire the liberties of England and the character of her people, but who does not see that English freedom has been nurtured from the earliest times by resistance to Papal authority, and established by the blessing of a reformed religion ? That is, under Heaven, the basis of all the rights we possess ; and the weight we might otherwise be disposed to concede

to M. de Montalembert's opinions on England is materially lessened by the discovery that after all he would, if he had the power, place this free country under that spiritual bondage which broods over the empires of Austria or of Spain.

In common justice to M. de Montalembert, it should be made known that the 'Authorized Translation,' published by Mr. Murray, is a loose and inaccurate paraphrase, rather than a faithful or conscientious version. The style is throughout defaced by expletives which generally militate against the context, and many of the finest images and figurative or condensed expressions are replaced by platitudes. Not a single paragraph, hardly four consecutive lines, can be cited which do not contain a blunder, or afford ample evidence in some shape that the translator's knowledge of French was superficial, and that he was utterly incapable of comprehending the author, although aspiring to improve both his logic and his language. It appears from a curious correspondence which has taken place in the newspapers on the accuracy of this translation, that it was published under the superintendence of no less a personage than Mr. John Wilson Croker, though that gentleman declares that he was not the actual translator. If this be the case we think that the author, the publisher, and the public had a right to expect a very different version of such a book. M. de Montalembert's trains of reasoning are sometimes extremely subtle, whilst his allusive and figurative language is often bold to the verge of temerity. No one consequently suffers more from inadequate translation; and it is a strong proof of the inherent merits of his book that it has elicited approbation and applause from many who have only become acquainted with it in so garbled a shape. But it is not the less our duty as critics and guardians of literary morals, to denounce in the strongest terms the levity and presumption with which the reputation of a distinguished foreigner has been trifled with by the individual, be he who he may, who is responsible for this so-called 'authorised translation.' M. de Montalembert has now publicly stated that prior to its publication he never saw a line of it, and that he repudiates a version which has weakened the force of his language and often entirely misrepresented his meaning.

M. de Rémusat's two volumes, entitled '*L'Angleterre au XVIII. Siècle*,' have only just reached us; unhappily too late for a detailed notice. They consist of a series of papers, contributed to the '*Revue des Deux Mondes*,' on our British statesmen from Bolingbroke to Fox, preceded by an introduction written during his exile in England in 1852, and a preface

recently added. Throughout, M. de Rémusat speaks of this country in terms of the most affectionate admiration, and of his own with deep sadness, but with a sanguine and pertinacious courage which refuses to despair. A remark in the preface on a certain peculiarity in the actual relations between the two nations is well deserving of attention. ‘*La nation anglaise n’a jamais peut-être formé de liens aussi étroits avec la France, et rarement la France a été moins près d’une parfaite intelligence des idées et des sentiments de l’Angleterre. Les partisans de l’alliance avec elle ne sont peut-être pas grands admirateurs de ses institutions ; et les anciens admirateurs de ses institutions ne sont guère partisans d’une alliance avec elle. Pour moi, je suis un admirateur des institutions de l’Angleterre et un partisan obstiné de l’alliance anglaise. Je ne sais, en parlant ainsi, à qui je plairai.*’ The hope and dream of M. de Rémusat’s life has been ‘*le gouvernement anglais dans la société française.*’ The object of his work is to discover and explain why ‘the English Revolution succeeded, while the French one failed ; why what is a reality in England is in France only a regret and an idea ;’—assuredly one of the knottiest and gravest problems ever propounded by a patriot !

If at the end of a fugitive paper we could venture on the presumption of briefly indicating the causes to which so philosophic a writer as M. de Rémusat has devoted two volumes, we should ascribe the non-success and transience of popular government in France to the following sources, most of which, if not all, have been already touched upon in various writings by M. Guizot, M. de Montalembert, and M. de Rémusat himself. In the first place, the French had to conquer and to *create*, while the English had only to preserve and to recover. Hence we, in our reforms, were always kept in check by the fact that we were striving after a definite and familiar past ; the French were adventuring on a new path, and struggling towards an unknown goal. ‘*L’imagination captivée par le passé s’égare moins que l’imagination séduite par l’avenir. . . . La nation anglaise, de tout temps, en réclamant ses droits, a entendu revendiquer un patrimoine, non poursuivre une conquête. En voulant des réformes, elle croit revenir à ses origines, et une sorte d’esprit conservateur préside ainsi à ses révolutions.*’

A second cause is what our author well calls *la maladie des extrêmes*. In France opposing elements, like opposing parties, seem to find it impossible to live together, much more to secure the diagonal line of right by the combination of antagonistic forces. All political contests, therefore, become wars of extermination, or at least wars *à l’outrance*. The stronger party is

not content with defeating its adversary, it must either annihilate or enslave it. Hence triumph is always followed by reaction; and the more decided the triumph, the speedier, the fiercer, and the surer is that reaction. Moderation and compromise are the two lessons which (as it seems to us and to M. de Rémusat) French politicians have yet to learn.

The third cause is, we think, a certain *mental gregariousness*, if we may so express our meaning, which makes it difficult for Frenchmen to stand alone or to oppose singly, or in company only with a few, the prevailing sentiment or creed. As one of themselves lately said to us, 'Nous sommes une nation très-*moutonnaire*.' Whether it be lack of moral courage, or the excess of a sympathetic disposition which makes them prone to excitement and *entraînement*, or a want of intellectual confidence in their own conclusions when these are at variance with that of those around them,—we do not venture to pronounce; but assuredly the French have in a much less degree than the English the spirit of individual independence. 'Alone against 'a crowd' few Frenchmen like to find themselves. An Englishman, on the contrary, rather enjoys the contradictory and perverse position. This defect among our neighbours has unquestionably been heightened by the intimidating nature of many of their more recent historical antecedents; by the fact that a man who opposes the power of the moment, whether popular or despotic, risks finding every career permanently closed to him by his audacity; by the absence of an organised aristocracy; and by those bureaucratic habitudes which have destroyed, by superseding, all associated action among private citizens.

Far from us be the unseemly and arrogant assumption that France is less deserving than ourselves of the blessings of free institutions and a Parliamentary Government. Our own history from 1660 to 1688, and the French history from 1815 to 1848, suffice to contradict and put to shame any such exclusive pride. Only we cannot avoid fearing that our admirers and imitators across the Channel, in endeavouring to restore and uphold Representative Government, by creating simply one or two elected legislative Chambers, are proposing to themselves to 'make bricks without straw';—that as long as Functionarism rides rampant and pervades every cottage, every corner, every act of domestic or social life; as long as the spirit of bureaucracy is suffered to kill the municipal spirit; as long as all *testamentary* liberty is withheld, and an effectual bar is thus placed to the growth and maintenance of an hereditary aristocracy—titled or untitled, privileged or not—but powerful enough and united enough to make head at once, as time and occasions

and provocations may require, against the tyranny of the crown and the tyranny of the populace,—no real Parliament can long exist in France, or would be able to maintain freedom if it did. Nay—if we may say it without offence—it may be that something more still would be requisite to secure permanent and solid liberty in France: namely, a vastly increased prevalence among the people of that civil courage, that stubborn individual pertinacity of independence, of which M. de Rémusat and M. de Montalembert have sung the praise so eloquently, and set so noble an example. And we are bound to say that, in reference to this virtue, the steadiness with which every friend of Representative Institutions has stood aloof for five years from the absolutism of the Imperial Government is a phenomenon of happy augury.

Of the future prospects of that Government, important as they are to the internal welfare of France and to the general tranquillity of Europe, it is not our intention here to speak; but the birth of an imperial heir* has given to the French people a fresh pledge of the duration of a dynasty sprung from the Revolution, whilst the auspicious conclusion of an honourable peace has shown the world that the Western Powers had not only the strength to carry on a war for political objects, but the forbearance to end it when those objects were accomplished. The alliance of the two greatest powers of Europe, which had been cemented by their common sacrifices, is now ratified by the triumph of their policy; and although, as we have shown in these remarks, there must ever be a wide distinction between the genius and the institutions of France and England, it is the most fortunate result of modern politics that these nations should learn year by year to know each other better, and to trust each other more.

* On the birth of the heir to the imperial throne, whilst the assembled senators were awaiting, with some impatience, the tidings which summoned them to the Tuileries, it was proposed by an accomplished literary senator to consult the *Sortes Virgilianæ* as to the future destinies of the Imperial Prince. A volume was brought by the librarian, but instead of a Virgil, it proved to be the *Argonauticon* of Valerius Flaccus. In this tome incision was made, and the passage which met the eye of the diviner, at the third line of the fifty-seventh page, was the following:—

‘ Oh socii! quandoque datur spes maxima cœptis,
 Vos quoque nunc vires animosque adferte paternos.
 Non mihi Theasalici pietas culpanda tyranni
 Suspectivæ doli; deus hæc, deus omine dextro
 Imperat.’ (Lib. I. 242.)

A passage not ill chosen, whether by flattery or by fortune.

NOTE TO ART. I.

Modern English History.—Memoirs of Mrs. Fitzherbert.

SINCE this Article was printed off, the 'Memoirs of Mrs. Fitzherbert,' by the Hon. Charles Langdale (1 vol. 8vo.), have been published. This publication has been caused by the statements respecting Mrs. Fitzherbert in the second volume of Lord Holland's 'Memoirs of the Whig Party,' to which we have adverted at p. 323. ; and its main object is to vindicate the memory of Mrs. Fitzherbert against the imputation of having contracted with the Prince of Wales a marriage which she knew to be ineffectual.

It appears from this volume that in August, 1833, certain documents belonging to Mrs. Fitzherbert were, with her consent, placed in a paper under the seals of the Duke of Wellington and Sir William Knighton, as representing King George IV., and of the Earl of Albemarle and Lord Stourton as representing Mrs. Fitzherbert, and that they were deposited in the bank of Messrs. Coutts, at the disposition of the Earl of Albemarle and of Lord Stourton. These documents are thus described:—1. The mortgage on the palace at Brighton. 2. The certificate of the marriage, dated December 21. 1785. 3. Letter from the late King [George IV.], relating to the marriage, signed. 4. Will written by the late King. 5. Memorandum written by Mrs. Fitzherbert, attached to a letter written by the clergyman who performed the marriage ceremony. All other letters relating to the transaction were at the same time burnt with the consent of both parties. It is stated that the express sanction of King William IV. was given to the deposit of the reserved documents at Messrs. Coutts.

Mrs. Fitzherbert died in March, 1837, and soon after her death Lord Stourton applied to the Duke of Wellington for his consent to opening the parcel at Messrs. Coutts, chiefly for the purpose of inspecting the paper marked No. 5. This application was grounded on the desire of removing doubts as to the existence of issue of the marriage. The Duke of Wellington, however, by a letter dated August 10. 1841, refused his consent, and protested solemnly against breaking the seals of the packet. In consequence of this refusal Lord Stourton abandoned his intention.*

* A letter from Lord Stourton on the subject of Mrs. Fitzherbert's marriage is inserted in this Journal, vol. lxvii. p. 556.

Lord Stourton died in December, 1846; he left an informal paper placing the documents at Messrs. Coutts' under the control and disposition of his brother, the Hon. Charles Langdale; he also bequeathed to Mr. Langdale the correspondence and memoranda relative to the deposit of the documents, and a short narrative of Mrs. Fitzherbert's life, written by himself, from her own information. After the death of Lord Albemarle, the survivor of the two trustees, the property in the sealed packet at Messrs. Coutts' seems to have become vested in his executor, the Hon. and Rev. Edward Keppel; and in November, 1854, Mr. Langdale applied to him for permission to open the packet, and publish its contents, so far as such publication should be necessary for refuting the statements in Lord Holland's *Memoirs* affecting Mrs. Fitzherbert's character. Mr. Keppel, having requested time for consideration, consulted the Duke of Bedford, and his Grace, with the concurrence of Sir G. Seymour and Mr. Forster, the executors of Mrs. Fitzherbert, advised that the papers should not be published. Mr. Keppel accordingly declined to give his consent, and the packet remains unopened.

Mrs. Fitzherbert was born in 1756, and was therefore six years older than the Prince of Wales. She was the daughter of Walter Smythe, Esq., of Brambridge, in the county of Hants, and was twice married before she attracted the notice of his Royal Highness. Her first husband was Edward Weld, Esq., of Lulworth Castle, in the county of Dorset; her second husband was Thomas Fitzherbert, Esq., of Swinnerton, in the county of Stafford. Mr. Fitzherbert died in 1781, leaving her a widow for the second time, at the age of twenty-five, with an independent fortune of 2000*l.* a year. We learn from Lord Stourton's authentic narrative that her acquaintance with the Prince of Wales commenced when she was residing at Richmond Hill; and that there she first became the object of his attentions, which, however, she did not encourage. This resistance drove the Prince to desperate measures. One day, Keate, the surgeon, with Lord Onslow, Lord Southampton and Mr. Edward Bouverie, arrived at her house in the utmost consternation, and informed her that the life of the Prince was in imminent danger, that he had stabbed himself, and that nothing but her immediate presence could save him. By this alarming intelligence she was induced to go, in company with the Duchess of Devonshire, to Carlton House, where she found the Prince pale and covered with blood. He told her that nothing would induce him to live unless she would promise to become his wife, and permit him to put a ring round her finger. A ring from the hand of the Duchess of Devonshire was used on

this occasion. 'Mrs. Fitzherbert being asked by me,' says Lord Stourton, 'whether she did not believe that some trick 'had been practised, and that it was not really the blood of 'His Royal Highness, answered in the negative, and said she 'had frequently seen the scar.' They returned to Devonshire House, and there a minute of what had passed was drawn up, which was signed and sealed by each of the party. On the following day she left the country, having previously sent to Lord Southampton a protest against the ceremony into which she had been reluctantly drawn, and she remained abroad for two years. She did not cease, however, during her absence, to be the object of the Prince's importunities; having first consented to promise that she would never marry any other person, she at last returned to England, and 'agreed,' says Lord Stourton, 'to become his wife, on those conditions which satisfied her own conscience, though she could have no legal claim 'to be the wife of the Prince.' The marriage was performed, immediately upon her return, by a Protestant clergyman, in the presence of her uncle, Mr. Errington, and of her brother, Mr. Smythe. No Roman Catholic priest officiated. A certificate of the marriage is extant, in the handwriting of the Prince, with his signature and that of Mary Fitzherbert. The names of the witnesses were added, but, at the earnest request of the parties, they were afterwards cut out by Mrs. Fitzherbert herself, with her own scissors. Other documents attesting the marriage, and a letter of the Prince, in which he repeatedly calls her his wife, are also preserved.

That Mrs. Fitzherbert entered into such a contract with the Prince of Wales as, according to the old Marriage law of Catholic Europe, before the Council of Trent, would have been a valid marriage, and as would be a valid marriage according to the present law of Scotland, we do not doubt. But in order to enable her to contract a valid marriage with the Prince of Wales, it was necessary, under the Royal Marriage Act, that the King's consent should be obtained. The existence of this obstacle must have been well known to Mrs. Fitzherbert; she was aware (as Lord Stourton says) that 'she could have no 'legal claim to be his wife;' indeed, according to the law of England at that time, the informal and private ceremony which was performed, even if there had been no legal incapacity in either of the parties, did not constitute a valid marriage. The performance of the religious ceremony, and the solemnity of the attestation, seem, however, to have satisfied her conscience. She likewise doubtless expected that the religious ceremony would touch the Prince's conscience, and induce him to make

some subsequent effort to invest their marriage with legal validity; especially as he had recently assured her in a letter (which was afterwards shown to Lord Stourton) that the King, his father, would 'connive at the union.' Before, however, the Prince could ask the King to consent to this marriage, he must have been prepared to forego his right of succession to the throne; for the Bill of Rights enacts that no person who should marry a Papist shall be capable of reigning in England.

The intimacy of Mrs. Fitzherbert with the Prince of Wales was first interrupted by his relations with a lady of rank, and afterwards by his marriage with the Princess Caroline of Brunswick. Some time after that marriage, the Prince sought a renewal of his connexion with Mrs. Fitzherbert, and 'numbers' of the royal family (as we learn from Lord Stourton) urged a 'reconciliation, even upon a principle of duty.' It appears, indeed, that Mrs. Fitzherbert referred it to the Pope to decide whether she ought or ought not to resume her conjugal relations with the Prince, after he had been married according to the forms of English law to another woman. The Pope decided that in the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church the former marriage and not the latter was valid and binding, and consequently Mrs. Fitzherbert returned to the Prince for eight years, until their connexion was interrupted by other circumstances. If this view of the case was really entertained at Rome, the Princess Charlotte must have been regarded by the Holy See precisely as Queen Elizabeth was. Mrs. Fitzherbert informed Lord Stourton that the King and Queen, and the other members of the royal family, had invariably treated her with kindness and consideration. But under the laws of this country, no doubt could be entertained as to the validity of the Prince's marriage with the Princess Caroline, or as to the legitimacy of the Princess Charlotte, and as to her right of succession to the throne.* If the marriage with the Princess Caroline was valid, the marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert must be a nullity.

Lord Stourton states that Mr. Fox, during the administration of 1806, made some overtures to Mrs. Fitzherbert in order to recover her good will, but that she refused them, though the attainment of the rank of duchess was to be the fruit of their reconciliation. In mentioning this circumstance to Lord Stourton, she observed that she did not wish to be another Duchess of Kendal. We do not doubt that Mrs. Fitzherbert derived this impression from some quarter, perhaps from the Prince of Wales: but before any serious offer of a peerage could have been made to her, the consent both of Lord Grenville and of the King must have been obtained; and we feel satisfied that

if the King's consent had been obtained, the fact would not have remained unknown until the publication of this volume.

The limits of a note prevent us from repeating several other interesting facts respecting Mrs. Fitzherbert, which are contained in this volume. She was undoubtedly an amiable and excellent woman. Notwithstanding the disappointments which she suffered, she was singularly free from malignity and bitterness; she was above all mercenary views, and never took advantage of her position to enrich herself or her relations; and in spite of her ambiguous connexion with the Prince of Wales, she always maintained her position in society, and was treated with universal respect. She had not sufficient confidence in the validity of the marriage ceremony with the Prince of Wales to found upon it any public claim; and she had too much honour to use it as an engine of private annoyance and extortion.

Upon the death of George IV., his successor, King William IV., honoured Mrs. Fitzherbert with an interview at Brighton, at which she showed him the documentary proofs of her marriage; whereupon his Majesty offered her the title of a duchess, an honour which she declined. He then insisted on her using the royal livery; and authorised her to put on weeds for his royal brother.

INDEX.

A

Arctic Discoveries. See *North-west Passage.*

Austrian Concordat, the, review of works relating to, 452—strange events during the pontificate of Pius IX., 452-3—reaction following the unusual doings of a 'liberal Pope,' 453—Pio Nono's flight, and Louis Napoleon's intervention in his behalf, 453—his lofty conception of his duties and powers as the 'viceregent of Christ, 454—zeal with which he carries out his Ultramontane pretensions in every country, 454-6—doctrine of the Immaculate Conception propounded by him, 456—reasons for opposing the policy of the Austrian Concordat, 456-7—historical evidence of the resistance of Rome to every national church, afforded in Hallam's 'History of the 'Middle Ages,' and Dean Milman's 'History of Latin Christianity,' 458—the Canon Law, *ib.*—the Church's assertion of supremacy, 458-9—conflict between the spiritual and the temporal powers, 460-4—luxury and grace of the Sicilian Court in the latter half of the 13th century, 464-5, and *extract*—Pope Gregory IX., and the Canon Law, 465-6, and *extract*—continual efforts made by succeeding Popes to fetter princes and people, and struggles for independence on their part, 465-7—the French Concordat of 1517, and the German Concordat of 1448, 467-8, and *note*—effects of the Reformation, 468—claim arrogated by the Pontiffs, of paramount authority over councils and kings, 469—the Jesuits, 469-70—causes contributing to the extraordinary revival at the present day of the highest Ultramontane doctrines, 470—the Council of Trent, 470-1—energetic resistance to the encroachments of Rome in the middle of the 17th century, 471—concessions made by the Popes in the 18th century, 472-3—advance towards independent religious action made in Austria under Maria Theresa and Joseph II., 473-5—Joseph's letter to the Pope, 475-6, *extract*—Febronius and Febronianism, 475-6, *note*—policy pursued by Joseph in regard to the Church, 477—the work entitled 'Enchiridion Juris Ecclesiastici Austriaci,' 477—objections taken to the form of the Austrian Concordat, 478-9—work in defence of the measure, entitled 'Studien über das Concordat,' 479—the Austrian Concordat considered as to its claim of absolute supremacy for the Church in ecclesiastical government, 479-84, and *extracts* and *notes*—next as to holding the whole system of education under its control, 484-5—thirdly, the Church's divine right 'to embrace the totality of the human mind,' 485-7—fourthly, as to the revival of the ecclesiastical jurisdictions,

with all their incidents and consequences, 487-90—and lastly, the consideration of the position to which the Concordat restores the Regular Orders of the clergy, 490-1—the principles and provisions of the Concordat opposed to the fundamental laws of every independent nation, 491-2—the expediency of the Austrian Concordat examined, 492-7—its probable effects on the welfare of the Austrian nation, 497-8—Chevalier Bunsen's protest against the Concordat under the title, 'The Signs of the Times,' 498—the Austrian Concordat not merely a German or even a European question, but one embracing every state and every people, 498-9.

B

Beyle's (Henri) Life and Writings. See *Stendhal, M. De.*

Body and Mind, review of works treating of, 423—importance of a right understanding of the reciprocal relations of body and mind, *ib.*—general want of sound knowledge on the subject, 423-4—empirical or popular knowledge by no means rare, 424—effects on the brain of opium, Indian hemp, henbane, and chloroform, 424-5—Sir Henry Holland's exposition of mental life, 425, and *extract*—the mind capable of only one notion or idea at a time, 425-6, and *extract*—on time as an element in mental functions, 426-7—rapidity with which states of consciousness succeed each other illustrated in the case of a man saved from drowning, 427-8, *extract*—dreams, and the apparent definiteness of time, 428-9, and *extracts*—Sir Henry Holland's remarks on the readiness of an 'excitable' person, and the slowness of a lymphatic one, 429, *extract*—approximative measurement of the rapidity of mental acts afforded in the case of astronomical observers, 430—the morbid mental state of double consciousness, 430-1, and *extract*—unconscious mental states, 431-2—unconscious development of ideas, 432-3, and *extracts*—extracts from Leibnitz in illustration of insensible perceptions, 433-4—Dr. Laycock's peculiar views on automatic mental states, and his applying them to a novel theory of instincts, 434—the brain and the spinal cord—their functions, 435-6—'cells' in the brain and in the spinal cord and ganglia, 436-7—the effects of mental attention on bodily organs, 437-8—particularly instanced in homœopathy and mesmerism, 438-9—sleep—what it is, 439-40—dreams—what the mental functions in, 440-1—spectral or delirious illusions, 442—singular results of *suggestion* in electro-biological 'subjects, 443—the dagger scene in 'Macbeth' a good illustration of the spectral illusions suggested by associated ideas, 443-4—Baron von Reichenbach's force in nature termed by him Odyle, 444—insanity considered, 445-6—what the changes in the brain during sleep are, 446—the uses of sleep, 446-7—danger arising from too frequently directing the mind inwardly upon itself, 447—on the memory as affected by age and disease, 447-9, and *extracts*—fertile source of knowledge afforded by the instincts and habits of the lower animals, 449—Mr. Youatt's description of a horse afflicted with rabies, 449-50—differences in the views of Sir H. Holland and Sir B. Brodie on

the subject of instinct, 450-1—merits and demerits of the works under review, 451-2—concluding observations, 452.

Britain. See *Rural Economy*.

C

Civil Wars (the), and Cromwell, review of works treating of, 1—origin of the Right Hon. Mr. Bankes's book, 1-2—its party-spirit, and partiality, 2-3—Sir John Bankes and Sir Edward Coke, 3—character of Strafford and his Irish administration, 3-7—of Clarendon, 7-8—Mr. Bankes's comparison of the history of London in 1641 with the history of Paris in 1793, 9-10—his disqualifications as a historian, 10—and superficial acquaintance with the facts of which he treats, 10-12—the character of Cromwell always popular with the great body of his countrymen, 13—three general views under which Cromwell may be described, 13-6—M. Guizot's view, 16-18—his 'authorised translator,' and specimens of his 'idiomatic' renderings, 18-23, and *extracts*—Guizot's father, and his own early career, 24-6—his remarks on a republic, and republicans, 26-28—his opinion of Milton, and of other great men of the Commonwealth, 28-9—his character of Cromwell, 29-30—Cardinal de Retz's contemptuous comment on Cromwell's want of systematic ambition, 30-1—Cromwell's motives weighed and considered, 32-4—M. Guizot's view of the religious element of Cromwell's character, 35-7—Cromwell as far removed from fanaticism on the one hand, as from hypocrisy on the other, 37-8—his religious toleration, 38—his correspondence with the governor of Edinburgh Castle, 38-9—his rebuke of the Rev. Mr. Hitch in Ely cathedral, 39—his steadfast reliance on Providence, 40—his personal appearance, 41—M. Guizot's general estimate of Cromwell's talents for governing, 41-2—Cromwell both feared and hated by France and Spain, 42-3—Cardinal Mazarin's deference and flattery, 43—Guizot's comment on Cromwell's bearing towards the French Minister, 43-4, and *extract* and *note*—Cromwell's letter to Cardinal Mazarin, 45, *extract*—character of Cromwell's foreign government, 45—M. Guizot's view of Cromwell's forcible dissolution of the Long Parliament, 45-7—Richard Cromwell's incompetency to exercise his father's authority, 47—the principles on which Cromwell based his foreign policy, 48-9, and *extracts* and *notes*—treaty of peace with France, and declaration of war with Spain, 49-50—Cromwell's patronage of literature and learned men, 50-1—his domestic love and tenderness, and M. Guizot's strange error regarding the supposed jealousy of his wife, 51-2—account of Cromwell's two eldest sons, 52-3—death of his son Robert, 54, and *note*.

Collier and Singer. See *Shakspeare*.

Corrector of Shakspeare. See *Shakspeare*.

Cromwell. See *Civil Wars*.

E

England, History of, review of Lord Mahon's, and other works relating to Modern English History, 305—Mr. Fox's Memoirs, and Lord Buckingham's Letters, 306—Lord Holland's Memoirs of the Whig Party, 306-7—character of the political period during Mr. Fox's career, 307—Dr. Johnson's view of Whigs and parliamentary government, 307, *note*—course taken with George III. by Whig and Tory Ministers, 308—Lord Stanhope's observations on the character and talents of Lord Rockingham, 308-9, *extract*—his account of the Tory and Whig parties in 1782, 309, *extract*—low estimation in which Lord Stanhope holds the Duke of Portland, 309-10, *extracts*—remarks on Lord Stanhope's assertions that the Whig party were dull men of large landed property, while the Tory party, comparatively poor, were men of genius, 310-11—favourable estimate of the Duke of Portland held by Mr. Pitt, 311-12, and *note*—large landed property not a qualification for the office of Prime Minister, 313—the battle of the people against the Crown fought by the Whig oligarchy during the early part of the reign of George III., 313-4, and *notes*—Lord North's government, 315, and *extract*—plan of Parliamentary Reform proposed by the Duke of Richmond in 1780, 315—Lord John Russell's remarks on the India Bill, commonly called Fox's India Bill, being in fact Mr. Burke's composition, 315-6, and *extract*—Mr. Prior's view on the matter, 316, *extract*—facts of the case, 316-7, and *extracts* and *notes*—Lord John Russell's remarks with respect to Mr. Pitt's long administration, 318, *extract*—Warren Hastings and his famous trial, 318-20, and *extracts* and *notes*—the Prince of Wales' marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert, 321-5, and *notes* and *extracts*—George III.'s mental disorder in 1788, and debates on the Regency question, 325-32, and *notes* and *extracts*—curious part played therein by Chancellor Lord Thurlow, 333-4, and *extracts* and *notes*—Burke's violent exhibition during the debates on the Regency question, 334, and *extract*—proposed new Ministry under the regency of the Prince of Wales, 335—convalescence of the King, *ib.* and *extract*—his popularity evinced by the great and universal illumination on occasion of his recovery, 336-7—want of filial duty on the part of the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York, 337—resentment of their royal parents, *ib.*—vindication of the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York drawn up by Sir Gilbert Elliot, *ib.*—conduct of the Prince of Wales on taking the government of the house at Windsor Castle into his own hands, 338—the French Revolution of 1789, and views of Mr. Fox, Mr. Burke, and Mr. Pitt thereon, 339-44, and *extracts* and *notes*—remarks on Pitt's policy towards France and declaration of war by the Convention, 344-5—the thorough Whigs nearly extinguished by the popularity of the war, 345, and *notes* and *extracts*—Lord Grenville's letters on the subject, 345-8, *extracts*—cause of Pitt's long administration coming to an end, 348-9—ill effects produced by George III.'s over-scrupulousness with regard to his Coronation

Oath, 349-50—the Catholic question in 1801, 350-1—change of Ministry in consequence, 352—remarks on Mr. Pitt's resignation of office, 352-5—Lord Loughborough's conduct, 355-6, and *notes*—Mr. Addington Chancellor of the Exchequer in the place of Mr. Pitt, 357.

F

Febronianism. See *Austrian Concordat*.

France. See *Rural Economy*.

French Judgments of England. See *Montalembert and Rémusat*.

G

Greek People, the, and the Greek Kingdom, review of works treating of, 386—Mr. Broughton's *Travels*, 386-7—singular contrast and revulsion to be traced between the feelings excited in Europe for Greece in 1820 and now, 387—glance at the causes thereof, 387-90—the Greek national character, 391-3—extent to which the Greek Kingdom has succeeded, 393—examination of the causes that have retarded or precluded its greater success, 393-5—sketch of the history and condition of the Greek nation down to the outbreak of the Greek Revolution, 395-401—the Greek or 'Orthodox' religion, 401-2—evil effects arising from the Turkish conquerors' settling in the principal towns, 402-3—the 'Klephts,' 403—circumstances that led to the outbreak of 1821, 404-7—charges of cruelty and perfidy against the Greek revolutionists considered, 407-9—four periods of the war of independence, 409-12—non-interference of the Christian Powers against Turkish oppression, 412-3—war of extermination carried on by the pasha of Egypt, 413—heroic defence and sufferings on the part of the Greeks, 413-4—tardy intervention of the Western Powers, 414—popularity of England in Greece, in 1824-5, *ib.*—reasons that induced Greece to court the protection of Russia, 415—if Greece is to be an independent State, what are indispensable requisites, 415—how little these were understood or considered by the Powers that established the present Greek Kingdom, 416-7, and *extract*—Capodistrias, 417—the Bavarian Otho's misgovernment, 417-9—Greece again a nation, 419—her admirable legal system, *ib.*—her improved commerce, 419-20—her activity in all intellectual pursuits, 420—unsettled state of her provinces, 420-1—what the present condition of Greece imperatively demands at the hands of England and France, 421-2—recent measures promulgated by the Sultan, 422.

H

Himalayan Journals, review of, 55—some account of Dr. Hooker, 55-7—the topography of Northern India, including the Himalayan range, 57-9, and *note*—an excursion to Benares, and a journey to Dorjiling, 59-61, and *extract* and *Notes*—aspect of the Himalayas from Dorjiling, 61—height of Kinchinjunga, Donkia, and Chumulari, 61-2—account of the Lepchas, 62-3, and *extract*—their kindness, good-humour, and fidelity, 63-4, and *extract*—expedition into

Eastern Nepaul, 64—scenery of the upper part of the Tambur river, 64-5, *extract*—final stages of the ascent of the Wallanchoon pass between Nepaul and Thibet, 65, *extract*—the glaciers of the Himalayas, 66-9—the level of perpetual snow, 69-70—variety and peculiarity of climate of the Himalayan range, 70-1—view from the Choonjerma pass, 71, *extract*—Kanchinunga, the highest mountain in the world, 72—Dr. Hooker's journey into Sikkim Proper, 72—insect torments of the woody regions of the Himalaya, 73, *extract*—his course up the valley of the Teesta river impeded by the opposition of the petty chiefs, and of the Rajah of Sikkim, 73-4, and *extract*—barren appearance of Thibet from the passes in the mountains, 74-5, and *extract*—fine view from the Donkia pass, 75—the Chalamoo Lake, *ib.*—ascent of the Donkia mountains, and survey of the barren wilds of Thibet, 75, and *extract*—Dr. Hooker's expedition among the Khasia mountains, to the North-east of Calcutta, 77—the *Jheels* of Bengal, *ib.*—prodigious abundance of the *Vanda cœrulea*, near the village of Lernai, 78, *extract*—humidity of the Khasias, 78—view of the snowy Himalayas, from the Khasia mountains, 78-9, and *extract*—Dr. Thomson's botanical explorations of the districts about Kashmir and Ladak, 79—his operations in the valley of the Indus and its tributaries, 80—his ascent of Kopenlan, 18,200 feet high, amid gigantic glaciers, *ib.*—his opinion as to the former greater extension of glaciers towards the plains, 80-1, and *extract*.

I

India, the use of torture in, Report of the Commissioners for investigating alleged cases of, 153—evils of the existing land system in India, 153-4—general incredulity of the British public as to the fact of torture being part of the system of Indian government, 154-5—origin of the Commission of Inquiry, 155—promptness and candour manifested by the government of Madras in assisting investigation, 155-6—the ryotwarry system of the Madras Presidency, 156-7—extent to which the charge of using torture is established, 158—copious and diversified evidence collected, 159—statistical information respecting cases of torture, 159-60—the two most common forms of torture—the *Kittee* and the *Anundal*, 160-1—other minor species of violence, 161-2—excessive cruelty of some of the devices of torture, 162—proneness of the natives to make false charges of this nature, 162-3—various instances in which torture by *anundal* or *kittee* was inflicted, 164-7—disgraceful ignorance of these facts on the part of those in authority, 168-9—how far the European officials are blameable in permitting torture to be practised, 169-71—difficulty experienced by the sufferers in obtaining redress when sought from the English officials, 172-3—pettiness of the sums for the exaction of which torture is applied, 173—cases of scandalous laxity in punishing those guilty of making use of torture, 173-4—wise severity exercised by Messrs. Daniell, Minchin, and Connolly, 174-5—assassination of Mr. Connolly, 175—effect of badly administered justice on the natives

mind, 175-7—staff of European officers miserably disproportioned to the population and area they have to overlook, 177-8—cruelties practised by the Nawab of Bengal, 178—torture general throughout India, 178-9—difficulties attending attempts to eradicate the practice, 179—how far we are responsible for the continuance of such an evil, 180.

L

Lectures to Ladies on Practical Subjects, review of, 146—Red Lion Square College for Working Men, and its scheme of operation, 146-7, and *extract*—remarks on admitting women to the advantages of the Institution, 147, and *extract*—principal objects kept in view in these lectures to ladies, 148—sisterhoods a desideratum among Protestants, 149-50—district visiting, 150-1—overwork, distress, and anxiety as causes of mental and bodily diseases, 151-2—communion of labour between the sexes brought about by means of these lectures, 152—concluding remarks, 152-3.

M

Modern History. See *England*.

Montalembert and Rémusat, MM. de, review of works by, 558—difficulty attending one nation rightly comprehending or appreciating another, *ib.*—instanced in the case of England and France, 558-60, and *note*—M. de Rémusat, and his admiration of the English, 560-1—M. de Montalembert—his life, political writings, and speeches, 561-4—Louis Napoleon—his usurpation of power acquiesced in by England, 564-6—cordial reception accorded to him and his Empress on their visit to England, 565-6—M. Montalembert's remarks on 'the political future of England,' 566-9, and *extracts*—relative position of the French and English forces in the Crimea now and at the commencement of the war, 569-71—soldierly qualities exhibited by the late Lord Raglan in the Crimean campaign, 571-3—opinion of MM. de Montalembert and Rémusat as to the supposed impossibility of a constitutional government conducting a war equally well with a despotic one, 573-4, and *extract*—England's chief dangers, according to them, 574-7, and *extracts* and *notes*—M. Montalembert's remarks on the English aristocracy, 578-82, and *extracts*—his favourable opinion of our system of public education, 582-3, and *extract*—our toleration of political offenders, 583-5, and *extract*—M. Montalembert's favourable notice of the extent to which, with us, individual action supersedes governmental, 585-7, and *extract*—unfortunate in his 'authorised translator,' 587—M. de Rémusat's 'L'Angleterre au XVIII^e Siècle,' 587-90.

N

Newton, Sir Isaac, review of books treating of his life and works, 499—brief sketch of his birth, education, personal character, habits, and pursuits, 500—his life at Cambridge university, 508-5—the memorable incident of the fall of the apple, and his theory of

universal gravity, 505-6—further details of his college life, 506-9—his discovery of the unequal refrangibility of the colour-making elements of white light, 509-10—saw anything but sought after by him, 510-1—Humphrey Newton, and his account of Newton's personal appearance and manners, 511-3—Newton an alchemist, 513-5—resumes his speculations concerning gravitation, 515-6—his 'Principia,' and Halley's zeal and generosity in making it public, 516-7—Newton's resistance to James II.'s interference with the rights of the university, 518—efforts for advancing Newton's worldly prospects, 518-9—difficulties attending the calculations of his lunar theory, 519-20—misunderstanding between him and Mr. Flamsteed, 520-2—the story of the dog 'Diamond' and the burning of Newton's papers, 522-3—his illness in 1692-3, and the consequent impairment of his faculties, 523-6, and *extracts*—appointed Wardeh of the Mint, and soon after advanced to the Mastership, 527—his niece, Catherine Barton, 528-31—Newton's personal appearance, disposition, and pecuniary liberality, 532-3—his love of tranquillity, 533—concluding observations, 533-4.

North-west Passage, review of works treating of the discovery of, 180—discoveries made by the Cabots, Frobisher, Behring, Phipps, Cook, and other early Arctic navigators, 180-1—expeditions under Ross, Parry, and Sir John Franklin, 182—uncertainty of Sir John Franklin's fate, and expeditions sent out in search of him, 183—the 'Enterprise' and 'Investigator' sent out under Sir James Clark Ross, but no tidings brought home of the missing navigator, *ib.*—the same ships sent out a second time under Collinson and M'Clure, *ib.*—brief history of Robert John Le Mesurier M'Clure, the discoverer of the North-west Passage, 183-4—account of the voyage, 184-6—course pursued by M'Clure, 186-7—M'Clure's dispatch to the Admiralty, 187-8, *extract*—further details of his discoveries, sufferings, and dangers, 188-9—preparations for spending winter in the Arctic regions, 189-90—once more afloat, and imminent peril of being 'nipped' between immense masses of ice, 190-2, *extract*—prepare for another winter, and are put on short commons, 193-4—excursions from the ship by sledge and boat, 194—ships sent out to them from England—their course and researches, 195-6—deplorable condition of Captain M'Clure and his officers and men, 196—resolution come to by Captain M'Clure in the hopes of obtaining help, 197—agreeable surprise on the 6th of April, 197-8—subsequent steps taken by Captain M'Clure to leave his ship in the ice and remove the crew to the 'Resolute,' 199-201—the voyage home, 201—rewards and honours awarded to the captain, officers, and crew of the 'Investigator,' *ib.*—Sir E. Belcher's 'Last of the Arctic Voyages,' 202.

Note to Art. I.—Modern English History: "Memoirs of Mrs. Fitzherbert," 591-5.

Part IX. See *Austrian Concordat*.
Prussia. See *Vom Stein*.

R

Red Séa. See *Suez Canal*.

Rémusat. See *Montalembert and Rémusat, MM. de.*

Roman Catholicism. See *Austrian Concordat*.

Rural Economy (the) of France and Britain, review of Lavergne's work on, 82—recent improvements observable in the streets and buildings of Paris, *ib.*—value and importance to France of successful agriculture, 82-3—superiority of England to France in machines used in agriculture, 83—inferiority of the southern departments of France in the essentials of successful and productive agriculture, 84—principal objects of M. Lavergne's book, 84-5—relative extent of land under cultivation in France and the United Kingdom, 85-6—relative qualities of the soil of the two countries, 86-7, and *extract*—difference and variety in the produce, 87-8, *extract*—average annual produce of the vineyards of France, 88-9—unprofitable nature of the cultivation of beetroot, 89—the live stock of the two countries compared, 89-90—the relative number and value of the horned cattle, 90-1—value of the dairy produce, 91-2, *extracts* and *notes*—superiority of English horses, 93—French poultry and eggs, *ib.*—French deficiency in live stock and inferiority in breeding and fattening cattle, 98-4—on the relative powers of the two countries to produce corn, 94-6, and *extracts* and *notes*—the money value of the agriculture of the two countries, 96—scarcity of animal food amongst the French, 97—comparison instituted between the value of land in France and England, 97-8—French and English landed proprietors, 98-9, and *extract*—principal causes of the superiority of British husbandry, 99-100—causes of French inferiority, 100-1, and *extracts*—M. de Lavergne's agricultural excursion through the British Isles, 101-2—past and present condition of the Highlands of Scotland, 102-4.

Ruskin, John (Mr.), review of works by, 535—evils resulting from false taste in criticism, 535—Mr. Ruskin's claim to be considered a guide in Art, examined, 536-7—his defence of Turner, 538-40—his devotion to the Pre-Raphaelites, 540—his contradictory dicta respecting architecture and painting, 540-50, and *extracts*—his incapacity to rightly appreciate High Art in painting, 550-2, and *extracts*—his attempts at literary criticism, 552-4—his idea of the colour 'brown,' 554-5—mode in which he deals with the collateral branches of Art, 555-7—concluding remarks, 557-8.

Russian Campaigns in Asia, review of works giving an account of, 267—importance to Turkey of events occurring in Armenia and the Caucasus, 267-8—vulnerability of Turkey on her Eastern frontier, 268—plan of proceeding adopted by the Russians, *ib.*—Russia's objects facilitated by the Christian population, *ib.*—plan of Prince Paskiewitsch in the Asiatic campaign of 1828-29, 269-70—General Ushakoff's description of Kara, 271-2, *extract*—Kara besieged by Paskiewitsch, 272—its surrender, 273—Paskiewitsch advances upon Akhaltsik, which he captures, and then besieges Akhaltsik, 274-5—its attack, defence, and surrender, 275-8—ad-

vantages gained by the Russians during the campaign, 278—plan of next year's campaign, 279-80—various successes on the part of the Russians crowned by their capturing the strong arsenal of Erzeroum, 280-3—the campaign of 1853-4, notwithstanding some successes, on the whole disastrous to the Turks, 283-6—the campaign of 1854, 286—daring outpost work by the Bashi-bazouks under General Kmety, 287-8—defeat of the Turks in the battle of Kurukdereh, 288-90—revolt of the Kurdish chiefs, and appointment of General Williams as British military commissioner, 291—his labours to store and strengthen Kars against a siege, 292-3—siege of Kars by the Russians under General Mouravieff, 293-4—assault driven back by the Turks on the 29th of September, 295-8—subsequent sufferings of the besieged from famine, 298—surrender of Kars, 298-9—Omar Pasha's operations, and his victory on the Inghour, 299-301—his position since the fall of Kars, 301—probable course pursued by the allies should the war continue, 302-3—the Eastern and Western Transcaucasian provinces, 302-3, and *note*—concluding observations, 303-4.

S

Scotland. See *Rural Economy*.

Shakspeare, review of works by and in illustration of, 358—Mr. Collier's mysterious 'Corrector,' 358-9—remarks on Mr. Singer's and Mr. Dyce's critical labours, 359-60—character of the alterations made by Mr. Collier's Corrector, 360-61, and *extract*—the Corrector's *modus operandi*, 362-3—errors of the early editions of Shakspeare, 363-4—uncertainty of conjectural emendations, 364-6—probable nature of the results we should arrive at in the event of the original MSS. of Shakspeare's plays being recovered, 366-8—how far the corrections in Mr. Collier's folio answer a conception of a really genuine text, 368—examples from Mr. Collier's Corrector, illustrative of his claims as an improver of the text of Shakspeare as it at present stands, 369-80—illiberality manifested towards Mr. Collier by his brother critics, 380-2—how far Mr. Collier's Corrector may be taken as an authority, 382-5—concluding remarks, 385-6.

Stendhal, M. De (Henri Beyle), review of works by, 203—obscurity of his early career, 204—his sudden popularity, 205—favourable reviews of his works by MM. Merimée, Saint-Beuve, Colomb, and Balzac, 205-6—brief biographical sketch of Henri Beyle's early days, 206-9—his conscientious conduct as administrator, 209—his account of the burning of Moscow, 210—his residence at Milan, 211—his residence at Paris, 212-3—griety attending his mode of living, 213-4—his extreme sensitiveness, 215—his residence at Civita Vecchia, 216—his peculiar idiosyncrasy, 216-7—his love of making himself appear worse than he really was, 218-9—his habit of mental analysis, 219-20—his hatred of Madame de Staël's style, 220—his 'Chartreuse de Parme,' 221-7, and *extracts*—state of society in France at the period of the Great Revolution, 227—Henri Beyle's 'Promenades dans Rome,' and 'Correspond-

'*ance Inédite*,' 228—Beyle's services in leading the French to appreciate Italian music, and the productions of the Romanticists, 229—his remarks on Classicism and Romanticism, 229-230, and *extracts*—*extracts* from his '*Correspondance Inédite*,' 230-1—his essay '*De l'Amour*,' more particularly the story entitled '*Le Pameau de Salzbourg*,' 231-3, *extracts*—his theory to account for the insensibility of English women, 233, and *extract*—his delicacy and depth of feeling, 233-4.

Suez Canal, the review of works treating of, 235—comparison between the difficulties attending the cutting canals through the isthmuses of Darien and Suez, *ib.*—steps taken by the French engineers towards cutting a canal to join the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, 236-7—commission of inquiry, and the result, 237—plan proposed by M. de Lesseps, 237-41, and *extracts*—M. Talabot's scheme, 241-5—Captain W. Allen's gigantic design, 246-8—difficulties attending the navigation of the Red Sea, 248-9, and *extract*—account of the old water communication between Suez and the Nile, 249-50—the Red Sea avoided by sailing vessels on account of its coral reef and dangerous waters, 252-3—high rate of freight and insurance in consequence, 253-4—steam navigation less hazardous and tedious, 254—*inquiry* how far a canal might prove useful for steam traffic, 254-5—the result unfavourable, 256—statistics of probable tonnage of ships using the canal given by MM. De Lesseps, Baude, and Talabot, 257—those from other sources, 257-8—*inquiry* into the probable reduction in freight such a canal would effect, 258-63—the political bearings of the question, 264-6—concluding observations, 266-7.

T

Torture in India. See *India*.

U

Ultramontanism. See *Austrian Concordat*.

V

Tom Stein, review of the life of, 104—respect with which he was ever regarded, 104-5—his origin and rise to political importance, 105-6—makes choice of the Prussian civil service, 107—occupies the post of Chief President of Westphalia, 108—his diplomatic services, 108-9—his skill in the selection of subordinates, 109—his vigorous exercise of authority, 109-10—his marriage with the Countess Wilhelmina Walmoden, 110—he succeeds Heinetz in the Prussian Ministry of Finance, *ib.*—reverses sustained by the Prussians, 111—Stein's efforts to convince Frederick William III. of the absolute necessity of reform, 112—becomes Minister for Foreign Affairs, 113—remarkable letter addressed to him by the king, 113-4—Stein accepts the king's offer of the Ministry of Finance and of the Interior, 115—ability with which he managed matters, 115-6—his labours to abolish serfdom throughout Prussia, 116-7—success in obtaining his efforts to obtain terms by which

the French agreed to evacuate Prussia on receiving a stipulated sum, 118-9—effects of the Spanish insurrection on the hopes of the Prussian patriots, 119—Stein's sanguine hopes of success against France, 119-20—is proscribed by Napoleon, and takes refuge, first in Berlin, and finally at Prague, 121—Niebuhr's alarm at Stein's perilous position, 122—joins Alexander at Wilna, in March 1812, 122—and advises the appointment of a German committee, 123—accompanies the Emperor to Moscow and St. Petersburg, 123—his plain speaking at the Russian Court, *ib.*—counsels important measures both civil and military, 124-7—his services to the cause of the Allies, 127—Napoleon's success at Gross Gorschen and Bautzen, 128—disagreement between Stein and Niebuhr, 129—Stein's opinion of Metternich and Nesselrode, 129-30—triumph of the Allies at Leipsic, 130—Stein appointed administrator of all conquered territories, 130-1—negotiations for peace unavailing, 132—triumphant entry of the Allies into Paris, *ib.*—Congress at Vienna, 133-4—third partition of Poland, 136—Prussian appropriation of Saxony opposed by England and Austria, 137—secret treaty signed by Castlereagh, Metternich, and Talleyrand for eventual resistance to Russia, 138—terms of the Conference at Vienna eminently advantageous to Alexander, 139—organisation of the Germanic body, 140-1—terms of the Restorative Act, 141-2—second and final settlement of Europe, 143-4—Stein resigns his official position and retires into private life, 144-5—his closing years, 145.

